Vol. XI., Nos. 9 & 10. DECEMBER, 1921, JANUARY, 1922.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A monthly Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Church of England.

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:—	
Modernism in the Near Future	461
A Liberal Appeal to the Universities	463
Plain Speech by Liberal Catholics	464
Anglican Exclusiveness	467
The Significance of the Ipswich Mission	468
Some Plain Words to Bishop Gore Dean Rashdall, D.D., D.Litt., F.B.A.	469
Religion and the Public Schoolboy E. M. Venables, M.A.	481
The Place of Modernism in the Church J. R. Cohu, M.A.	497
Reunion from the Quaker Point of View E. Grubb, M.A.	506
Modernism and Reconstruction F. E. Powell, M.A.	515
Some Criticisms of the Cambridge Conference C. W. Emmet, B.D.	524
The New Jerusalem and the Rose Eternal Canon M. G. Glazebrook, D.D.	533
In Memoriam—Eugène Ménégoz M. C. Dawes, M.A.	543
Book Notices Belief in God; Christian Idealism; Anthropology and Ethics; 'Sinite Parvulos'; The Untried Door; Lyra Evangelica.	544
Correspondence:—	
The Creed of the Average Englishman	555
The Country Parish and Reunion	556

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 2/- net. Annual Subscription, 10/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—BASIL BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF LIBERAL RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President—Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER, F.B.A.
The Rev. Canon CREMER, M.A.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY, M.A.
The Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW, M.A.
Sir LAURENCE JONES, Bt., M.A.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE, D.D.
The Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON, M.A.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon H. P. PLUMPTRE, M.A.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq.

Members of the Council, 1921-22.

Chairman—Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Miss E. M. ALLEN, M.A.
Professor Sir W. ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Mr. P. H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Rev. C. BASS, M.A.
Right Rev. A. HAMILTON BAYNES, D.D.
Rev. J. WORSLEY BODEN, M.A.
Prebendary CALDECOTT, D.Litt., D.D.
Rev. A. J. CARLYLE, D.Litt.
Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A.
Rev. W. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG, M.A.
Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D.
Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON, M.A.
Mr. W. B. GORDON, M.A.
Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.
The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, D.D., C.V.O.
The MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBS.
Principal F. B. JEVONS, Litt.D.
Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
Mrs. MICHELMORE.
Rev. W. D. MORRISON, LL.D.
Mr. CLAUD MULLINS.
CYRIL NORWOOD, D.Litt.
Miss D. NUSSEY.
Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D.
Rev. C. E. RAVEN, B.D.
The Very Rev. HASTINGS RASHDALL, D.Litt., [F.B.A.
Rev. G. RENDALL, D.Litt., LL.D.
Principal Sir HARRY REICHEL, LL.D.
Miss MAUDE ROYDEN.
Mrs. REITH.
Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A.
Rev. E. ST. G. SCHOMBERG, M.A.
Rev. C. J. SHARP, M.A.
Rev. H. R. L. SHEPPARD, M.A.
Mr. NOWELL SMITH, M.A.
Canon TOLLINTON, D.D.
Mr. H. F. WALKER.

Offices—10 CLIFFORD STREET, BOND STREET, W.1.
Hon. Secretary and Treasurer—PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
Assistant Hon. Secretary—Miss DOWELL.
Hon. Auditor—ROBERT WARNER, Esq., F.C.A., 221 Moorgate Street Chambers, E.C.
Hon. Librarian—Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D., St. Aidan's Vicarage, South Shields.
Hon. Secretary to the Annual Conference—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Bankers—LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members, at least 7/6; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to—

The Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 10 Clifford Street, Bond Street, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent **free** to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 9 & 10. DECEMBER, 1921. Vol. XI

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Modernism in the Near Future.

It is clear that Modernism in the English Church will have a hard struggle during the next few years against the forces of obscurantism and reaction. The English Church Union, which all who know it recognise as a very powerful body, well organised, courageously led, and with large resources, is resolved during the next few years to defeat the forces of progress and comprehension, and in particular to use its organising powers to secure such an ascendency in the National Assembly as will enable the Anglo-Catholic Party to dominate the Church of England. In the meantime it proposes to secure the censure and suppression of Modernism.

At the recent meeting held by the English Church Union at Sion College the following resolutions were passed, the first unanimously, the second with two dissentients, 'presumably non-members of the E.C.U.'

'That, in view of the statements published in the official report of the "Modern Churchmen's Conference" held at Cambridge in August, 1921, the members of the English Church Union in ordinary meeting assembled desire to place on record: (1) their adherence to the Catholic doctrines of the Holy Trinity and of the Incarnation, as expressed in the Creeds and defined in dogmatic decisions of Œcumenical Councils, in the sense in which they have been generally received in the Church, (2) their conviction that the canonical Scriptures of the New Testament contain an authentic record of the revelation of the said doctrines.'

'That the members of the English Church Union in ordinary meeting assembled request the President and Council to present to each Provincial Synod in England and Wales a petition praying that synodical judgment be passed on the report in question.'

Modernists will feel entire sympathy with the first resolution. They agree that their fellow-Churchmen have an absolute right to hold fast the traditional views, and pass resolutions affirming them, if they will. The passing of such resolutions is a comfort and help to the weaker brethren, and charity forbids that it should be refused.

The second resolution comes in another class. It is an attempt to fetter reverent research and to check theological thought, by restricting them to ancient ways of thinking and speaking. It is really a denial of the existence and of the lawfulness of theological development and re-statement. Yet any modern study of Church History indicates that theological development and re-statement have characterised the Church's most vital periods. The modern student of doctrine cannot but realise that the orthodoxy of one period becomes the heresy of the next. Millenarianism was orthodox in the first century, but was regarded as heresy in the third. Adoptionism was orthodox in the days when *Acts* was written, but heresy at the time of the Council of Nicaea. The Arians claimed antiquity as in their favour, and there seems reason to believe that Alexandrian Christianity was Arian in the century before Arius. Dean Rashdall, whose promise of a book on Christology will be welcomed by all our readers, claims, if we mistake not, that even Athanasius *contra mundum* was really Apollinarian. Only very slowly are the English clergy realizing the fact that Christian theology is dynamic, not static; and that Christian orthodoxy has changed, is changing, and will change.

When the traditionalist writes *semper eadem* on the dogmatic system of the Church, the inscription can only deceive the ignorant or those who, being resolved to maintain this position at all costs, refuse to recognize facts. If the traditionalist could once be brought to grant that Christian theology has changed, he would then have to answer three questions. Why has it changed? Is it right that it should change? May it rightly change again?

When these questions are truly answered, traditionalists will be in a better position to consider without prejudice what happened at the Cambridge Conference. They will then

perceive that what was attempted there might more rightly be described as a needful and proper development of Chalcedonian theology than as a denial of it.

Although we have no doubt that the English Church Union agitation is bound to fail in the long run, yet we are sure that it will have a detrimental effect in the interval. It will frighten off a number of thoughtful young men from taking Holy Orders, and so tend to lower still further the intellectual influence of the clergy; it will sharpen party differences: it will increase the number of laity who are losing all interest in the Church. In the coming conflict, there are two things that Modernists should face resolutely. First, the insidious devices which are being used to divide them against each other, and secondly, the attempt to frighten them into silence. And there is one thing the whole Church needs to face resolutely: the attempt to intimidate the Bishops to limit English comprehensiveness by excluding those who are the strongest defenders of that principle.

We are glad to think that on this occasion the English Church Union will not, as on a former occasion, receive the support of the Evangelical party, who now see clearly that the militant Anglo-Catholics are becoming daily nothing more than fanatical imitators of Romanism. Their doctrine, their liturgical practices, their ecclesiastical ideals, are all rapidly approximating to those of Rome. Should our Bishops, which is very unlikely, hearken to the English Church Union in this crisis, they would simply be delivering themselves and the Church of England into the hands of those whose eyes are fixed not on the chair of Augustine but on the Papal tiara.

A Liberal Appeal to the Universities.

The University of Birmingham celebrated this year the twenty-first anniversary of its foundation. At the Commemoration Service Canon Barnes preached from the text:

> 'Strive for the truth unto death, and the Lord thy God shall fight for thee.'—*Ecclus.* iv, 28.

The preacher prophesied that religion would revive, and when revived would be essentially Christian in character. Materialism, he said, was seen to be inadequate, and no type

elevation of his nation must firmly and faithfully take a steady and dutiful part in the work of his parish. If he does not, he loses any moral right under the new conditions to complain. He can make Sparta whatever he and his fellow-Spartans will. 'Little children let us not love in word and in tongue, but in deed and in truth.'

But apart from parochial activities and parochial politics, it will be absolutely necessary for some years to come for those whose Church ideals are those of the Churchmen's Union to maintain an influential organization in every diocese in order to secure and promote the vital interests of English religion as they understand it. We believe that whether the English race is to be Christian in the future depends upon the form in which the Christian Religion is constantly presented to it. If that form be truthful, progressive, reasonable, predominantly moral and practical, England will remain a Christian country, but if that form be obscurantist, dogmatic, reactionary, England will become, like France, a nation of which the greater part of the male population is frankly sceptical if not actually anti-Christian.

The Churchmen's Union has done useful work in the past. It has to-day a membership and influence which belongs to no other Liberal Church society. We must not here recount the form which its activities have taken nor attempt to estimate the exact scope of its influence for good, but it must be apparent to any thoughtful observer of English Church life, that, as the result of recent legislation, an enormously increased sphere of usefulness is opening up to the Churchmen's Union. Its ideals and activities are more than ever needful. But to seize this great opportunity, increased membership and increased funds are needed; more numerous branches and better attended meetings are requisite. The work of the Churchmen's Union is both educational and organizing, and there is great scope here for lay activities. We look to younger men and women to carry on and make the ideals of the Churchmen's Union the ideals of the Church of England of the future.

There is nothing to prevent their doing this, if they will throw themselves into the work. But the end is not to be attained except by prolonged and resolute endeavour.

MODERNISM AND THE CREEDS

By the Rev. R. F. CARDALE, M.A.

WHAT has been said in my article in the December *Modern Churchman* makes it sufficiently clear that to Modernists historical statements or theological dogmas cannot be regarded as above discussion : it cannot be assumed that the mind of the Church is finally made up and closed in reference to them even though they are enshrined in the Creeds, which are reverenced by believers because they have through so many centuries embodied the revelation of God in Christ.

The Modernist's position is that to place the Creeds in a sphere which is beyond discussion and to refuse to submit them to the test of experience, is ultimately to destroy their authority : for authority is the result of a free consensus brought about by the Holy Spirit operating through the consciences and reasons of the faithful. Further, the authority of the Creeds must be destroyed if, while nominally they are regarded as being subject to free discussion and criticism, the Church claims the power to determine beforehand what the results of such discussion and criticism may be. There can be no freedom of discussion and no free consensus can be achieved under any such conditions as these. Again, if the Modernist distinction between Content and Form is not admitted and it is claimed that the Creed as it stands is the essential faith of a Christian, infallibly revealed and perfectly expressed for all time, both as to statements of doctrine and of historic fact—discussion and criticism are clearly unnecessary and presumptuous. Conscience may demand a disinterested and courageous facing of facts and examination of evidence. Reason may protest that what claims to be an historical statement must submit to historical criticism. But the voices of conscience and reason must be silenced.

petty rules of ceremonial observance or of Church order as (for all practical purposes) equally essential with the most central matters of religion, can necessarily only find an occasional place in its thoughts, as quite side issues, for the great ethical questionings of our age.'

The Rev. E. O. Iredell, preaching on October 27th on 'Intellectual and Devotional Freedom in the Church,' said:

'A recent issue of the *Church Times* grudgingly admits that Modernism may have helped some souls to find the faith; but it peters out with the amazing conclusion that in spite of this we are putting grievous difficulties in the way of a far larger number of souls. The fact, of course, is that Liberalism never put any difficulty before men: it is solely concerned with the difficulties which already exist and which, apart from Liberalism, are either ignored, or, if tackled at all, are still in full swing. The *Church Times* does not seem to see that its criticism falls heaviest on the quality of faith possessed by those "unnamed and unnumbered multitudes" about whom it feels so much concern. A faith which can so easily be shaken can hardly be founded upon a rock.

'There is a fear of Truth itself, expressed to-day in the cautious and specious admission that theological enquiry should be allowed *within certain limits*. Who has any right to prescribe such limits save God? What have we to fear from the frankest investigation? If the Creeds are true, there can be no objection to free and unlimited discussion of them. If they are not true, then the sooner they are unmasked and disposed of the better for all of us. It matters enormously that a man should be able to express his belief sincerely. For his belief is, or should be, the inspiration of his life. It is a lie to say, as do some of us, that we hold it doesn't matter what a man believes so long as he lives a good life. If you believe what is false, you will reflect that falseness in some particular department of your life.

'It is useless to maintain that historical criticism and scientific research are not God's methods of teaching this generation the lesson of the gradual unfolding of truth, and are not therefore the works of the Spirit of promise, functioning exactly as we were told He should. We are quite alive to the margin of error inevitable where human agency is concerned. This must be a risk which we are ready to take, because we do intensely believe in Divine Truth, Divine Purpose and Divine Guidance.

'The problem before us is: How can we, as Catholics, reconcile new ideas and fresh outlooks with the old conceptions, based as these were from surveys gained from observation posts at a lower altitude than ours and therefore with a more circumscribed panorama? Surely the view which is open to us to-day reveals all that was clear before, and more. It does not contradict what was true before, but amplifies and explains it.

'We do not claim to see the solutions of any of our problems: we only think we see the road along which the solution lies. The truth is very much wider than we had imagined, and finality is the last thing we postulate about any position. For we feel, as Liberals, that succeeding generations will be better equipped than we are for estimating the relative value of those dilemmas which, with our present terminology and amazing ignorance, perplex and bewilder us.

'We are, it is true, impatient, not of authority, but of uninspired and coercive authority. So was our Lord. He shows the Spirit of Liberalism in its most extreme form. We try to apply His tests to the institutionalism of our day.

'We are not out to teach certain dogmas. We hope to spread the Spirit which quickens and therefore liberates. We ask of certain teach-

ing: Is it true? Does it fit in with fresh appreciation of the many-sided aspects of God's character revealed in scripture, in Jesus, by tradition, by the experience of God gained in the past, verified, modified, or deepened, by the experience of devout souls to-day and in past ages. Of a custom, or an observance, and so forth we ask: Is it useful? Does it still continue to serve the purpose for which it was ordained, or is it, like so much of the Jewish tradition which provoked Christ's condemnation, only the outward survival of a spirit long since dead?'

These criticisms of traditional Catholicism by Liberal Catholics are, we fear, only too well deserved, as illustrated by two recent events. The Bishop of Zanzibar has withdrawn from the Lambeth Conference because Canon Dorrity, with the consent of Dr. Temple, has invited five eminent Free Church ministers to give addresses in St. Ann's, Manchester, on 'Our Common Faith.' The Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton has instituted monthly 'Lady Masses' in St. Magnus the Martyr, London Bridge, 'as an act of reparation to our Blessed Lord and His Mother . . . for the teaching that is being given and connived at in the Church of England, subversive of the fundamentals of the Catholic Faith.'

Anglican Exclusiveness.

The recent sermon on 'Anglican Exclusiveness' by the Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford forms a suitable pendant to his Bampton Lectures. Anglican exclusiveness he showed to be a combination of social exclusiveness, academic exclusiveness, and religious exclusiveness. The first two kinds of exclusiveness are breaking down rapidly, but the third kind, based on a particular view of episcopacy, is still obdurate. There is no objection to Anglicans setting a high value on episcopacy, and even on what is known as apostolic succession, provided they value even more highly the call of the Holy Spirit and His ministerial gifts as the essentials of a valid and effective Christian ministry. There is no objection to our placing a high value on our liturgical practices, provided we do not deny the validity of sacraments administered in other Christian communions. The sermon concluded on a note of hope and warning. Dr. Headlam said:

> 'We may hope in the future to build up a wide, bold, free Catholic Church; we may believe that that Church will preserve just those elements which we feel are so healthy; but we cannot build up that Church unless we lay aside our pride and exclusiveness, and are prepared to go to others without pretension and without assertion; unless we are ready to recognise their work as often much better than our

own, their Orders as exhibiting all the signs of a true commission as known by their fruits. The Church of England is at the parting of the ways; she is called, I believe, to take her place in building up the religious unity of the world, but she will fail in her mission unless she is prepared to lay aside her exclusiveness and is ready to go out humbly to meet all other Christians. You cannot be the heralds and harbingers of the great Catholic ideal unless you lay aside Anglo-Catholic narrowness.'

The Significance of the Ipswich Mission.

The accounts of revivalist missions do not inspire us; they advertize so much and achieve so little of permanent value. What has been happening at Ipswich would seem to come in another category.

In the latter half of September a concurrent, not an inter-denominational, mission was begun in every church and chapel in Ipswich. The results have been remarkable in two directions. A new feeling of unity has sprung up between the different denominations; and a new feeling of fellowship between different classes of citizens. This new spirit has shown itself in a practical way, namely, in a desire to learn the truth in religious and social matters, and in a vigorous effort to harmonize the differences between employers and employed, and to relieve the depression and poverty of the workless.

In consequence of the Mission, many new organizations have sprung up: a ministers' fraternal; study-circles to study Christ and the Gospels; tutorial classes to investigate social problems; conferences to deal with unemployment and to settle labour difficulties. Apart from the definite organizations created, the point best worth noting about the Ipswich Mission is that the old individualist conceptions of salvation, so characteristic of Evangelical and Catholic Missions, would appear to have been replaced by the ideal of social salvation. Certainly the Mission has led to a real desire on the part of the inhabitants of Ipswich to make Ipswich something more like the City of God than it was before.

Many workers took part in the movement, but not the least influential of the missioners was the editor of the *Challenge*.

In Ipswich we seem to have a type of Mission in which those Liberals and Modernists who cannot use the language of either emotionalism or ecclesiasticism, might be able to take a useful part.

SOME PLAIN WORDS TO BISHOP GORE

By the Very Rev. H. Rashdall, D.D., D.Litt., D.C.L., LL.D., F.B.A.,
Dean of Carlisle.

I. *Obscuring the Issue.*

BISHOP Gore has spoken with such extreme kindness of me personally at the E.C.U. meeting at Birmingham, that it may seem ungracious in me to complain of the tone and manner of his controversial methods as distinct from the matters of actual theological difference between us. Nevertheless, I cannot but feel that there is something to complain of in what he has said about the Cambridge Conference in general and about myself in particular. And I feel bound to put on record in a connected form a statement of the way in which he has dealt with us. I shall do so with some plainness of speech, but I trust that nothing I say will be inconsistent with the affectionate reverence with which I have always regarded Bishop Gore as a man, or with a due recognition of his earlier efforts to do what we are trying to do now, *i.e.* to present a statement of the Christian faith intelligible to, and believable by, those who have accepted the conclusions of modern science, modern critical scholarship, and that modern way of looking at the Universe which is shared by millions who know but the most general and universally accepted conclusions of science, and who hardly understand the very meaning of the word 'criticism.'

It will be remembered that last August a conference took place at Cambridge, the general subject of which was 'Christ and the Creeds.' At this conference a number of papers were read by members of the Churchmen's Union and others—men writing without any previous consultation and representing considerable divergences of view, but united by a certain general sympathy with liberal theology. Reporters were present at the conference, and they were supplied with an abstract of the papers read. In a number of London and provincial journals, there appeared various highly-coloured and misleading reports of these papers, and of my own in particular. A few of the more respectable journals published curtailed, but just and honest, reports of what was said. The unfairness of others

extended to other papers than my own, but I must here confine myself almost exclusively to the way in which my own paper was dealt with. The misleading reports were of three kinds:

(1) There were those which correctly reported certain negative statements of mine. These were put briefly:

(*a*) Jesus did not claim divinity for Himself.

(*b*) Jesus was in the fullest sense a man, as much as any other human being, and 'had not merely a human body, but a human soul, intellect, will.'

(*c*) The human soul of Jesus did not exist before His birth.

(*d*) Divinity does not imply omniscience.

(*e*) The Divinity of Christ does not *necessarily* imply the Virgin Birth or any other miracle.

I then proceeded to defend the doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord, and to state in plain and untechnical language the sense in which that doctrine could, as it appeared to me, be affirmed, consistently with these denials. The first class of misleading reports reproduced my negative statements, prefixed a number of more or less inflammatory head-lines, in which free use was made of such epithets as 'amazing,' 'surprising,' 'startling,' 'unorthodox,' and the like, and said nothing about my positive affirmation of Christ's Divinity.

(2) There were journals which heralded these statements with the heading, 'Dean denies the Divinity of Christ.'

(3) Others proceeded actually to support this lie by putting into my mouth words which I had not used. When I had said 'Christ was man,' they added 'and not God.'

I wrote to all the papers which had published garbled statements, so soon as they came to my notice, pointing out their misleading character. When they had attributed to me an express denial of the Divinity of Christ, I demanded an apology and retractation under threat of an action for libel, and obtained it in every case; though of course the apology was sometimes thrust away into the corner of the newspaper and was probably not seen by thousands who had seen the libel; and then there were no exciting posters or head-lines. I further sent a contradiction to the *Guardian*, *Church Times* and *Record*; each of these journals was good enough to publish it in the same number which contained their first report of the matter.

Some of the more enterprising journalists further sent round interviewers to various more or less eminent clergymen, armed with these garbled reports, and requested their opinion about them. That ecclesiastics of a certain type should have jumped at the opportunity of denouncing 'Modernism' and various individual 'Modernists' by name will, of course, excite no surprise. But that a man of Bishop Gore's character and position should have solemnly pronounced judgement upon the whole group, and upon me in particular, on the basis of these garbled reports is a fact which would have seemed absolutely incredible, had it not occurred. I do not know which sort of garbled report was supplied to him, but apparently he actually accepted the statement that I and others had denied the Divinity of Christ, and proceeded to comment on our views upon that assumption. The pronouncement began with these words: 'Nothing but good can come of the frankness with which the Dean of Carlisle and Mr. Major and Dr. Foakes-Jackson have been explaining to the world that the Liberal Churchmen (though I grudge them the name), or Modernists, really feel able to believe.' After insisting on the necessity of believing in 'the Virgin Birth and the corporal resurrection of Christ,' he proceeded, 'they cannot believe in the Godhead of Christ,' and afterwards 'they abandon the Godhead of Christ and the Atonement.'

I would briefly insist on the extraordinary unfairness of this proceeding. He couples together 'The Dean of Carlisle, and Mr. Major and Dr. Foakes-Jackson.' Now, not one of these three men had expressly denied the Divinity of Christ—not even Dr. Foakes-Jackson. But no doubt the whole tone of Dr. Foakes-Jackson's paper was such as to suggest a doubt as to whether he believes that Jesus was in any distinctive sense divine or even a particularly good or remarkable man. Neither Mr. Major nor I, nor any other of the writers of papers had the smallest sympathy with Dr. Foakes-Jackson or his colleague, Professor Lake.[1] These writers had, indeed, on this central question of the personality of Christ, very few sympathizers among members of the conference generally, however sincere may be our respect for much of their work.

[1] Joint-editors of *The Beginnings of Christianity. Landmarks of Early Christianity* comes from the pen of Prof. Lake only.

Bishop Gore was doubtless acquainted with the writings of all the clergymen mentioned. He must have been perfectly aware that the whole tone of the writings of Mr. Major and myself as regards the Person of our Lord differed *toto caelo* from the attitude with which Dr. Foakes-Jackson was associated: in fact Dr. Foakes-Jackson's paper was a criticism of just the sort of attitude which Mr. Major and myself and most Anglican Liberals adopt. Bishop Gore must have known that the attitude of Mr. Major and myself differs from Dr. Foakes-Jackson's as much as—probably in the estimation of outside observers much more than—the attitude of Bishop Gore himself differs from mine. Yet he deliberately, with a view of exciting prejudice, included all three of us in one common indictment, and thereby conveyed to the average reader of the *Church Times* and other papers in which his remarks appeared the impression that we were all in the same boat. And all this on the basis of an exceedingly curtailed newspaper report which was, in point of fact, false, and before we had an opportunity of correcting the falsehood. I am sure that on no subject except theology could Bishop Gore have been so blind to the requirements of ordinary fairness and straight dealing between man and man.

I must add that there was a peculiar unfairness in attributing to me a denial of the Atonement. I had only two years before published a volume of Bampton Lectures on 'The Idea of the Atonement,' in which I had defended a view of that doctrine which Bishop Gore had every right to disagree with, but which was substantially the view held by Origen, by Abelard, by Peter the Lombard (the famous 'Master of the Sentences'), by William Law, by Bishop Westcott. To call such a view a 'denial of the Atonement' without qualification, explanation, or justification, is simply a libel. And the untruth was absolutely irrelevant to the point at issue: since the papers at the conference did not deal with the Atonement at all. There is further an insinuation that Modernists in general 'hold a sort of Pantheism, which affords no effective moral support for life.' If there is a central and characteristic doctrine of Christianity in the view of 'Modernists' as a body, it is the doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, and such a doctrine obviously implies a

conception of the Personality of God which is the antipodes of Pantheism. In my own case my philosophical writings should have protected me from this insinuation. It is true the charge is not made against me in particular: but if a writer first mentions certain 'Modernists' by name, and then proceeds to attribute certain tendencies to them, Bishop Gore must know very well that the average reader will suppose that the writers mentioned are examples of those tendencies. And there is as little ground for the insinuation against most, or all, of the other writers involved.

Having read the contradiction of the report as regards myself published in the *Church Times* and elsewhere, Bishop Gore proceeded not to withdraw, but to justify his false accusation. In a letter to the *Church Times* of September 2nd, he writes:

> 'My estimate of Dr. Rashdall's doctrine concerning our Lord's person was based it is true upon newspaper reports of what he said at Cambridge—an insecure foundation, I admit. But I should not have accepted them as genuine if they had not coincided with conclusions inevitably drawn, as I thought, from Dr. Rashdall's books, with which I am fairly well acquainted. However, Dr. Rashdall's protest printed in your issue of last week, indicates, I hope, that I am mistaken. I await the publication of a full report of the Cambridge Conference, and if I prove to have been mistaken, I shall be only too glad to apologize most humbly.'

Such a quasi-apology really makes matters worse. The Bishop refuses to take my word for the statement that I had not denied Christ's Divinity. It is inconceivable that Bishop Gore can fail to see the enormous difference between an explicit denial of Christ's Divinity—an assertion that the Church's doctrine is in no sense true—and the holding of opinions which in the view of an expert theologian like himself may be judged inconsistent with a true interpretation of the credal and conciliar definitions of the doctrine. In all my writings which touch on the subject, including *The Idea of the Atonement* and various printed sermons and articles published still more recently, I had contended that the doctrine of Christ's Divinity as defined by the Creeds, though expressed in the language of obsolete Greek metaphysics, is fundamentally true, and that my interpretation of it is a legitimate interpretation. Yet Bishop Gore professes to think it

credible that I should suddenly get up, and in a public conference turn my back upon all my previous utterances, and announce to the world categorically, 'The doctrine is not true: I do not believe it.' For that is what I was accused of doing: and Bishop Gore thought fit to use all the weight of his immense authority to induce the world to believe that I had done so. And then, instead of apologizing frankly (as the newspapers under threat of an action had done), he makes a promise of a future apology conditional upon its turning out that he was satisfied with the interpretation that I had put upon the doctrine in the not yet published paper. The average Christian naturally regards with supreme horror the utterance of a clergyman who formally and definitely denies what is commonly regarded as the central doctrine of Christianity: he is comparatively indifferent to the question whether, in the opinion of theological experts, the sense which he puts upon the doctrine is or is not reconcilable with the difficult, and to him quite unknown, technicalities of the Chalcedonian decrees and the like. It was the former impression of my paper which excited the published attacks upon the conference papers, and the hundreds of abusive letters published in provincial newspapers or addressed to myself personally: it was this impression which Bishop Gore used his authority to strengthen, and which he refused to correct even after he had read my contradiction, and after he could have read reports which were at all events full enough to show that it was misleading. It is true that, in the opinion of thousands of readers, the opinions which were correctly attributed to me did involve a denial of Christ's Divinity. But nobody knew better than Bishop Gore that this was not so. None of these statements excited more surprise, or were more hotly denounced as denials of Christ's Divinity, than the two statements, (1) 'Christ had a human soul,' and (2) 'Divinity does not imply Omniscience.' Bishop Gore knows, but the critics whom he was encouraging do not know, that the first doctrine is part of the traditional Catholic Faith, to deny which is heresy; and that the second has been defended by Bishop Gore himself, and is accepted by practically all cultivated theologians of the present day.

Since the appearance of the *Modern Churchman*'s full report of the conference, Bishop Gore has dealt with the ques-

tions raised in two manifestos—in an article published by *The Church Times* of September 23rd, and in another addressed to the English Church Union at Birmingham on October 10th. Even now he makes nothing that I can call an apology, 'humble' or otherwise, though an apology was promised if the report should prove to be false. In this and future articles I propose to deal with some of the criticisms which Bishop Gore has made upon the position of Liberal Churchmen[2] generally, and especially upon my own. I shall confine myself strictly to this question of the Divinity of our Lord, and shall not diverge into such questions as the Virgin Birth or of miracles generally. I should like to premise that my treatment of the subject must necessarily be scrappy and incomplete. The proper reply to such criticism as that of Bishop Gore—the only satisfactory way of filling in the outline which I give of a possible interpretation of the doctrine in my little paper at Cambridge—is a book, a book which should include a survey of the history of the doctrine, an estimate of the permanent philosophical value of the enormously various doctrines defended at different times by writers now commonly regarded as equally orthodox, and an attempt to decide how much of the elaborate structure which they have built up is capable of defence or re-statement in the language of modern philosophy. Such a book I hope, if I live, to write; but such a book is an affair of years. Meanwhile, I hope I may do something—in a quite tentative and provisional manner—to meet some of the difficulties which the Cambridge discussion may have raised in the minds of many, and to answer some of the more serious objections which have been urged against it by Bishop Gore and others.

Bishop Gore must be perfectly aware that at the present day the Divinity of Christ is—I should personally say through various misunderstandings—denied not merely by Agnostics or non-Christians and by avowed Unitarians, but by vast numbers of men who continue to be members of so-called 'orthodox' Churches. Even a general acceptance of the language of the Creeds and the Councils is rare among scholarly or highly educated laymen; while the 'man in the street' is mystified and

[2] It is probably too late to protest against the application of the term 'Modernist' to an Anglican group, but for myself I greatly prefer the old phrases, 'Broad Churchman' and 'Liberal.'

alienated by the technical language of the creeds on the subject and still more by the common teaching about it which he has heard in the Church and the Sunday School. Such is emphatically the testimony of Army Chaplains and ex-Chaplains. This being the general state of opinion, one might have supposed that an attempt to find a modern meaning in the ancient formulae would be treated with a certain measure of sympathy by men like Bishop Gore. I do not for a moment wish to disguise from myself or from others the fact that I do not understand the 'Divinity,' or (if he prefers it) the 'Deity' of Christ as the Bishop understands it; nor do I wish to deny that my whole way of looking at the Universe differs widely from that which underlies the technical language of the Creeds and Councils: I should say the same of any modern mind—Bishop Gore's included. But one would suppose that an attempt to find a real and an important meaning in these formulae would have been welcomed as far as it goes. One would have been prepared to find that more conservative theologians might dissent from my particular interpretation, might point out its insufficiency, might even argue that, when intellectually thought out, it would lead to the denial of the belief which the writer wishes to defend: but instead of that, Bishop Gore writes with a bitterness and a severity which I find it hard to understand.

This bitterness concentrates itself in an accusation that I have committed the 'intellectual offence of obscuring the issue.' Though he is kind enough to treat the offence as intellectual only, it is apparently wilful, inasmuch as the Bishop 'cannot doubt that a man of his intellectual acumen knows what the issue is,' and he suggests that I have a motive in concealing it, though he charitably declines to ask what that motive is. Now, I do not think this charge of obscuring the issue is at all just. I should have thought that it was exactly because I have discussed these questions with more frankness than some others—I do not mean my friends at Cambridge, but clergymen who, probably thinking very much as 'Modernists' do, prudently keep aloof from such conferences, and confine themselves to harmless generalities—that I have, both before the conference and since, come in for an unusual amount of theological vituperation. If I had wanted for purposes of my own to use vague language, which should conceal the points at issue as regards

the Divinity of our Lord, and to give the impression of an orthodoxy to which I have no claim without positive insincerity, I do not think I should have found an enterprise in which so many succeed altogether beyond my capacity.

And here I should like to say a word as to a peculiar hardship which besets the position of Liberal clergymen. If from a wish not to shock or offend, to avoid wounding tender consciences or disturbing the faith of the unlearned, we avoid positive contradictions of orthodox dogmas or popular interpretations of them; if, like the vast majority of our clerical brethren, we keep silent upon some things and are content not to raise some questions; if we do not speak about some questions which we have not fully considered; if we do not in our ordinary teaching insist upon mere negations, we are accused of disingenuousness and insincerity. When, on the other hand, we speak plainly, no matter how reverently, and when we try to get to the bottom of things and to help real thinkers, then we are accused by Bishops, especially the more Liberal Bishops, of insufficient regard for the feelings of the average Churchman. There is no way of steering between this Scylla and Charybdis except absolute silence, and if that is disingenuous, resignation. And if every educated clergyman were to resign who held beliefs, the blunt assertion of which would distress and surprise the very ignorant, what would become either of the Bishop of Durham or of Bishop Gore? It cannot be too distinctly recognized that what shocks the very ignorant Churchman is not questioning the decrees of Chalcedon, but 'not believing the Bible,' in a sense in which most certainly neither of these prelates 'believes the Bible.'

In the first of Bishop Gore's utterances, in a postscript, he does at last admit that the writers generally 'have so real a devotion to Christ that he has for them "the value of God"'; and in the second (after speaking about the predilection of the reporter for anything of a 'rather exciting and stimulating nature') that 'on this occasion, serious wrong has been done by this kind of one-sidedness and lack of balance in the reporting of more than one speaker in that conference.' This is a very mild way of putting a downright lie—the statement that I had said that Christ was 'man and not God,' when in point of fact I had said that He was both. At Birmingham Bishop Gore

even declares, as regards myself personally: 'I know that [illegible] a pre-eminent sense he believes in His Divinity.' I thank him for this act of tardy justice; but I cannot help remarking that it would have had more value if he had made it earlier, when I was suffering from the effects of the mendacious reports, instead of giving all the weight of his authority to the falsa rumour until the knowledge of its falsity had come to be generally diffused. His conduct is at least better than that of the Roman ecclesiastics—notably Cardinal Gasquet—who continue to lie about 'high dignitaries of the Anglican Church who deny the Divinity of Christ,' as if no contradiction had appeared.

I now return to the Bishop's charge of 'obscuring the issue.' I think I know pretty well where the point of difference between Bishop Gore's position and my own lies. Only I must protest against the assumption that this difference necessarily coincides with the difference between orthodoxy and heresy. The Bishop makes it plain that the point which he thinks I am trying to conceal, and which he has found out, is this:

> 'I cannot think that Dr. Rashdall holds that the person who appeared as Jesus Christ was really an Eternal Person in the Blessed Trinity, who at a certain date took flesh and became man, remaining always the same. I feel sure that for Dr. Rashdall the Person of Jesus began to exist when He was born of human parentage. And yet the former of these theories is the theory which Catholic terminology is quite deliberately fashioned to express, and so to express as to exclude the second.'

There is an extreme difficulty in discussing the theories of a writer who talks so much about 'personality' without the smallest attempt to indicate the meaning of the term. He does not tell us either what is the ancient theological sense of 'Hypostasis' or 'Persona,' or what he understands by 'personality' in its common acceptation. But it is pretty evident he assumes that when the 'Persons' of the Holy Trinity are spoken of, the term 'Person' is used in the same sense as that in which we say that Bishop Gore is one person and I another person—that the three 'Persons of the Trinity' are three separate minds or 'centres of consciousness.' Now, whatever may be the meaning either of the Greek term 'Hypostasis,' or of what ultimately came to be accepted as its Latin equivalent, 'Persona,' I hold it to be quite certain that neither at first, nor later, were the

used in the ordinary modern sense of the word. Bishop Gore himself speaks of the 'Personality of God,' *i.e.* the Holy Trinity, the One Being who is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. If the One God is a Person, and the Son alone is a Person, it is almost self-evident that the word cannot be used in the same sense, unless indeed the Bishop is prepared to say that One Person may include other Persons—a position usually held only by philosophers whom Bishop Gore would probably label 'pantheistic,' and who are usually not very emphatic in their assertion of the Personality of the God of whom we are all supposed to be parts, even if they do not altogether deny it. I do not see how Bishop Gore could avoid assenting to the assertion of Richard of St. Victor—a very orthodox Schoolman—that:

> 'if anyone wishes to understand the name of Person under its common and proper acceptation, in no way may he think that more persons than one can subsist under that acceptation in the unity of substance.'[3]

I do not see how anyone with much less than Bishop Gore's knowledge of its history could deny that in the accepted doctrine of the Holy Trinity the word 'Person' is used in a highly technical sense; and this fact by itself implies that, when the Second Person of the Trinity is spoken of as remaining the same Person before and after the Incarnation, the term is also used in a technical sense. When a 'plain man' hears that 'Jesus Christ'—not 'the Son of God' or 'the Word'—who appeared as Jesus Christ was really 'an Eternal Person in the Blessed Trinity, who at a certain time took flesh and became man, remaining always the same,' he would naturally suppose either that the human soul of Christ was an 'Eternal Person' of the Holy Trinity, or that the term '*appeared* as Jesus Christ' must be understood in a quasi-docetic or Apollinarian sense. Bishop Gore would not accept either alternative; and therefore it is obvious that here, too, the phrase 'one and the same Person' cannot be understood in the sense in which we usually use the phrase 'personal identity' about an ordinary human being.

[3] '*Si quis velit personae nomen sub communi et propria acceptatione intelligere nullo modo putet plures personas sub ea acceptatione posse subsistere in unitate substantiae.*' *De Trin.* iv. 1. The passage is quoted by Dr. Ottley, *Doctrine of the Incarnation* ii., p. 252.

clergy are prohibited by the Canons from pursuing secular callings, but why could not a large number of our lawyers, journalists, bankers, merchants, civil service officials, and other members of the educated classes, become honorary clergymen? They would earn their living by their week-day secular occupation, and devote their Sundays and some of their week-day leisure to the duties of the Christian Ministry. The Rev. Roland Allen has, we believe, advocated this, especially for the work of the foreign mission field, but we are of opinion that there is quite as much to be said in its favour in the home-field. We believe that it would strengthen the influence of the Christian ministry enormously and help to deprive it of its caste character and somewhat doctrinaire treatment of many practical and social questions. This remedy would entail a great increase in the numbers of the clergy, as they would be less than a half-time clergy, but a large body of clergy of this kind would be an unspeakable advantage. The relations between the paid and unpaid ministry would no doubt present problems, and the tendency would be to subordinate the unpaid to the paid ministry, but this we believe would be a mistake. Some of the higher clergy, such as bishops, would have to be paid because they would have to be whole-timers; but there are other cases where the paid clergy might work in subordination to the honorary clergy. We hope that the experiment will be made on a large scale. Important parishes might be handed over to them and a large measure of freedom and initiative granted in administrative posts. We believe this to be a more promising move than the development of the honorary lay reader system. All who have worked, especially in the Dominions, know the enormous debt which the Church owes to the honorary lay-readers; but that system, especially in England, needs supplementing. The worst way of supplementing it is by developing an organization of salaried lay-readers or salaried Scripture-readers and lay evangelists. We believe that while the system of honorary lay-readers should be maintained and encouraged and as far as possible developed, a system of honorary secular clergymen should be introduced at once, and on large-hearted, courageous lines. We need to have far less official red tape in the conferring of Holy Orders, and at the same time far more

RELIGION AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLBOY

By the Rev. E. M. Venables, M.A., Assistant Master in Harrow School, Author of *Prayers for my Son*, *Sons of God*, &c.

SUCH a vast subject as religion, such an elusive problem as the public schoolboy, cannot be treated exhaustively in a single paper. All I can hope to do is to say some of the things which seem to some schoolmasters to be most immediately relative to the religion of the public schools in general. No doubt all realize that public schools differ enormously from each other. Yet, in spite of so much diversity in schools, there are certain characteristics of their religious life fairly common to all.

Boys are naturally responsive to spiritual influence at some time in their school life, and almost always between the years nine and fourteen. A considerable experience at a preparatory school convinced me of that, for I saw the influence of a gifted private schoolmaster fashioning among his boys real Christian-minded characters which have borne rich fruit later. Boys are at some age really genuine searchers after spiritual truth, and they are far more deeply religious than their more demonstrative sisters. They often have a touch of the mystic. But they are very reserved about religion. Any tactless effort to make them speak about it is disastrous. Until their confidence is deservedly won, they will not intentionally reveal anything. They are extraordinarily quick to perceive the difference between a real and a sham religion. A 'showy' kind of religious person they dislike. Their sense of humour finds merciless amusement in any religious mannerisms. On the whole they say prayers, at any rate in the evening, and a few read their Bibles, though rather perfunctorily. They show very little interest in the Church, as an institution, and have practically no knowledge of its history. In spite of their distinct capacity for individualism, they act at times like sheep. They combine considerable reverence with acts of surprising irreverence and thoughtlessness. They fail, however, to have any real knowledge of how religion applies to life in general or their life in

particular. Their capacity for spiritual faith is checked by their feeling that the Christian religion is the religion of a book; that their prayers are not really of practical value in helping them to live their lives better, but rather acts of obedience to what they have been told to do—indeed, a sort of tradition. They soon lose at school their sense of the personal side of religion, of the presence of Christ with them. They vaguely believe certain things about our Lord, but they do not understand their significance. They gather that the Bible contains their religion, and they find it very confusing to study Old Testament with New Testament teaching.

Let me consider here for a moment these two points in particular—Prayer and the Bible. Boys' prayers are usually rather thoughtless repetitions of boyhood's utterances. They have never changed their phraseology. Yet their whole outlook on life has changed vastly from what it was in their childhood. Their interests are different, their knowledge of good and evil wider, their difficulties greater. It would be a real help if parents would give their boys more careful and pertinent instruction about prayer. *Teach them that prayer is not merely asking for things; it is a spiritual effort to become something.* Do not let them feel that they are praying to a distant and somewhat aloof Being, or to a meek and gentle Person who once taught in Palestine and is believed to have wrought miracles. Give them the benefits of your own spiritual insight, your own meditations, your own devotions. Prayer is the opening of one's soul's windows to the sunshine of the Divine Love. To tell them even so much will do something, at any rate, to make the connexion between prayer and conduct and life more real to them.

Then with regard to the Bible: the insistence which is laid upon the Old Testament is, in my view, a mistake. Not infrequently boys will defend wrong conduct by an appeal to the Old Testament. Moreover, they are brought up in the idea that the Old Testament is *the Word of God*, but in their heart of hearts they don't believe it. What connexion can there be, they feel, between the teaching of Christ and, shall we say, the crudities of Jehu, the pomps of Solomon, or the vindictiveness of many of the psalms? Theologians know all about this no

doubt. But there are very few theologians. The average boy thinks and sometimes says that Jacob was 'an oily devil'! Yet he seemed to be God's favourite! It would be, I believe, an advantage if the Old Testament were not taught until boys were capable of reading it as an historical record of an interesting people. Boys—and some grown-ups too—fail to see how their own religious life is affected by the doings of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; nor do they really believe that Abraham was their forefather! Tradition's iron grip has much to answer for. If the young are to be taught the Old Testament, let the stories be told to them just as other stories. It is far better for them to think them mere stories and later to perceive their religious truth, than to be told that they are religious truths and later to regard them as mere stories. It is a sin against the young to teach them anything that must be unlearned later. And you cannot build a living religion upon a shifting foundation.

But to return to the boy himself; in spite of his natural responsiveness to things spiritual, he knows when he comes to his public school next to nothing about the *facts* of his faith. Yet this does not alter the fact that he is religious-minded. But if by religion is meant anything sectional, pronouncedly denominational, the boy is not religious: *e.g.* if anyone thinks that being what some people call 'a good Catholic' is the one and only way of being religious, most boys are not religious; if religion is an abstract doctrine, boys are not religious; if it demands outward piety, or a habitual sense of inward holiness, or of inward sin and need of redemption, boys are not religious; if to be religious forbids any flippancy and culpable thoughtlessness in speech, boys are not religious.

But if by religion is meant a real desire to know the spiritual side of life more intimately; to know who Jesus Christ was and is; to discover what He taught and why and what it all means; a distinct wish, if it be possible, to follow Him; a readiness to do things for other people; a good deal of what psychologists call 'emotional sensibility' and 'passive suggestibility,' then boys are indeed religious-minded.

Perhaps one of the most outstanding characteristics of boyhood is what one may call the spirit of chivalry. Boys will

respond extraordinarily quickly when this sense of chivalry is appealed to; for they are generous-hearted and very ready to give unstinted service whenever their imagination is touched. Moreover, they manifest a fine spirit of corporate loyalty to each other, and up to a point, though in a different way, to their masters, if the latter treat them with natural sympathy and with human—and humorous—consideration. They are ready to forgive acts of injustice to themselves, always provided that such acts have been acknowledged wrong by those who committed them. But they are capable of harbouring collective distrust of anyone on the slightest suspicion, however ill-founded, of underhand action.

I cannot help believing that Jesus Christ would build upon a boy's open-hearted, chivalrous-minded enthusiasm for service, a living religion, practical, personal, devotional. I believe that to be the method of approach. Let them aim at the highest things, and they will find them in Jesus Christ, and as a result they will find Jesus Christ in them.

In saying this I may seem to challenge those who, as many people think, make religious education too abstract, too formal, too full of rules, too one-coloured, too divorced from living. But have they ever realized how profoundly difficult it is to make boys understand even the simplest doctrine with its personal application? I cannot but believe that if our schoolboys, collectively regarded, are expected to view religion through the spectacles of extremists, of whatever kind, we must destroy our public schools, build some kind of monastic establishments, attach schools to them, and shut our eyes. But would the Kingdom of Christ among men be thereby advanced by one minute or by one foot? Rather would I have boys taught collectively the great facts of the Fatherhood of God, with its corollary of human Sonship, goodness through the Holy Spirit, and the brotherhood of all men in the service of one Master and of each other in the name of Christ. If in learning these facts a boy's imagination is sufficiently quickened and his interest stimulated, he will ask questions, and here is the opportunity for individual teaching. But the general teaching must surely be simple, clear and broad. For a school is a corporate body composed of every variety of faith and thought and experi-

ence. And when one comes to consider it, what an amazing variety it is! Think for a moment of some of the types. The great-limbed young giant and the undeveloped, timid child; the highly-imaginative boy and the vegetable; the buoyant hustler and the sensitive shrinker; the emotional and the dull; the coarse-minded and the refined; the pure-hearted and the sensual; the reliable and the shifty; the worker and the 'slacker'; the pliable and the stubborn, &c., &c. And all these have an equally varied parentage; the real Christian, the party Non-Conformist, the party Churchman, the respectable Sunday worshipper, the Laodicean, the utterly worldly, the inordinately rich, the openly irreligious, &c. And there, in the school chapel, are their sons, all of equal value in God's eyes, and we schoolmasters, laymen and priests of every shade (and sometimes the shade is very tenuous) of religious thought, have to help them to find Christ. Surely a big problem and an even bigger responsibility! I find myself a little impatient as I read the somewhat partizan strictures of schoolmasters by 'A Prefect' in a publication of a few years ago from the Society of St. Peter and St. Paul. If this varied mass of youthful, imaginative, tempestuous virility can learn to do Christian things for the sake of Christ and their fellow-men at some cost to themselves and by virtue of faith in God, this in itself is no small achievement.

Now, what do public schools in general do to educate and develop a boy's instinct for religion?

First, there are the Chapel Services. The attendance at services, with the exception of the Holy Communion, is practically always compulsory; a regrettable, but it seems an unavoidable, fact. There at once is an element of weakness, a sense of routine, discipline, formalism being inevitable where there is compulsion. There is a vast difference between the religious atmosphere of a compulsory service and of one which is voluntary. Boys are very ready to attend voluntary services. They will of course say that by going to the service they may perhaps get off some work, or something of that kind; for all boys are remarkably quick to perceive the personal advantage of any particular course of action; they are also very like sheep in copying one another. But even admitting this, the fact re-

mains that the spiritual atmosphere at a voluntary service is a thousand times more genuine, more vivid, than it is at other times. Boys feel they are going to hear or take part in the real thing; they will be made to think; the service is perhaps going to affect their conduct, their actions, their beliefs; it is going to concern the heart rather than the Prayer Book; there will be quietness, not the incessant talk and restlessness of other services; they may get help; they know they want it. Boys only need to be put into touch with the unfettered workings of the Holy Spirit to make them ready to listen, to pray, to think, to serve. The hackneyed routine of official religion is Christ's worse enemy, not only in schools, but even more so throughout the Church. It tends to make of organized religion a rock of offence instead of an instrument of the Kingdom of God. But services in school chapels are less hide-bound than those in parish churches. Variations are introduced and needless repetitions are as a rule eliminated; to confess three times on Sunday is considered superfluous; lessons and psalms are often chosen with more careful regard for simple spiritual teaching than for satisfying a mere routine; it is sometimes thought good to explain lessons before reading them; but even granting these improvements, something else is needed. What that is depends, I suppose, on the individual point of view. But a change in the way of introducing more silent prayer, more of a missionary atmosphere, more voluntaryness, more variety, more extempore prayer (though avoiding a Caledonian prolixity!), more incentive to worship, must be, I think, desirable. Chapel services are hearty, simple, and in most schools the reverence compares quite favourably with that in our churches, though boyish thoughtlessness needs occasional correction. Purposeful irreverence occurs from time to time, but it can be checked, especially by the example of others, whether boys or masters—or parents.

I cannot help believing that the religious hold of Christianity at school and in our churches generally would be greatly strengthened by a courageous policy of giving a clean cut to all unchristian psalms, to all obscure prayers, to all undesirable passages in the Bible, to all meaningless phrases and responses, to all Mosaic utterances about keeping the Sabbath Day, and

the coveting of oxen and the making of graven images, &c. People who meditate upon and love the things of the Spirit find such an impediment in this organized antiquarianism that they seek outside the visible Church the Divine sources of inspiration. And they find them. Religion is life. Then let it express itself in a living way.

But the chapel services at school, whatever their drawbacks, and especially Evensong, with its sermon, have a lasting and valuable effect upon great numbers of boys. Sermons, if fairly brief and sincere, boys really appreciate. Any 'talking down' to boys is hopeless. They literally detest sermons about 'playing with a straight bat,' or 'getting into training,' 'the cricket of life,' and all the rest of it. Mere incitements to the pagan virtues of purity, honesty, &c., are of little permanent value. Boys like the original, but resent the sensational. They despise a jaunty familiarity. They appreciate a genuine Gospel sermon, spoken from the heart and carefully prepared, not read. Doctrine in heavy doses they find tedious, but argument holds them. Sectarianism (very seldom heard) is hopeless. In dealing with boys, if not with all people, we cannot too often remind ourselves that if God is true, He is universal; the main point is to find Him: like a great magnet He will draw all men to Him. Does it matter by what way we reach Him? To get people into the orbit of His attraction is the work of organized religion, not to restrict too closely the avenues of approach. And this is especially so with boys. It is the *life* that counts after all, and if we can help them to see that our outward life depends on our inwardness, our God-wardness, they will get within that orbit of God's attraction. To be a believer in Christ demands certainly no less attention to the Sermon on the Mount than to the Apostles' Creed. Do the works, and you will learn the doctrine. School sermons and the whole service should be more insistent upon this fact. The man who has really 'given up all' has invariably a very attentive hearing from boys.

In the last two generations services in school chapels have improved greatly. Any passing despondency over them—occasionally the lot of many schoolmasters—is soon lessened by a perusal of old records. But the improvement would be still more marked if all schoolmasters could take their responsible

place in helping to give life and vitality to chapel services and to the religious education of boys generally. A united effort would not fail in effect. Boys are very quick to observe and to imitate. If parents were more interested in and insistent about this, much might, automatically perhaps, be achieved. But they seldom show any interest. Yet when all is said and done, the school chapel stands very high in the affection of boys, especially in later life: for with the advance of years we all learn that life without religion is a very barren thing; and our school chapel, we gratefully remember, stood for religion, and for the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God, though in our youth we did not quite realize it. So much, then, for chapel services.

A second factor in religious education at public schools is, preparation of boys for Confirmation.

Boys are nearly always prepared for Confirmation by their Housemaster. As long as boys are confirmed at public schools it is right for a Housemaster to take a very large part in this extraordinarily difficult and important work. He is obviously the person to do so, provided that his religious ideas enable him to do it without prejudice to himself or his boys, without having to violate his own beliefs. With regard to the question of *when* a boy should be confirmed, opinions differ widely. The usual age is about $15\frac{1}{2}$—$16\frac{1}{2}$, which to the present writer seems practically always the wrong age. At that age a boy is physically and mentally changing. He is restless, uncertain, moody, perhaps rather suspicious, often tempestuous, seldom at his best. Whatever he may be taught at this time about spiritual things, and however carefully, he will in all probability forget all about it in a very brief time, simply because his mind was in so unreceptive a state when being taught. He cannot be regarded as a small boy nor as a big boy. He is neither. He is, as a rule, incapable of responding to what one may call the simple faith of boyhood: at the same time he is too undeveloped in mind and body to be conscious of what he wants, or to grapple with the more complicated facts of religion and life. Boys should be confirmed when they have been led by right reasons to desire it. On the whole the present writer has been led to believe that, in the majority of cases, boys are most

helped by being confirmed *early*. Indeed, it is highly probable that were boys prepared for confirmation at their preparatory schools, and confirmed either there or almost immediately after entering a public school, the results would be more encouraging than they are under the present system. Not, however, in all cases. But, generally speaking, it would, I believe, be best. The small numbers in preparatory schools, with the resulting increased intimacy between boys and master, makes so much more possible a sympathetic, understanding, individual preparation of boys. There would also certainly be more opportunity of testing the sincerity of a boy's intention than there is in the public schools. Moreover, the habit of prayer is so much more naturally and effectively inculcated in boys at the preparatory school age.

If confirmation is postponed beyond the age of fourteen, it is wisest to wait until the boy has almost finished his school career. He has by that time lived through some difficulties, and become familiar with the sort of problems, religious, intellectual, moral, that he will have to face, and he is capable of making considered decisions in the light of personal experience. His preparation should not *necessarily* be in the exclusive hands of his housemaster. He will need the help and guidance of personal faith and knowledge. It is all to the good that the 'class system' of preparation is gradually being superseded by a more individual method. Confirmation preparation is an individual business, of which the collective or community aspect only becomes helpful and real as the result of massed *individual* conviction and aspiration.

Formalism in preparing boys is hopeless. It has nothing to do with learning the Catechism by heart, or conning bits of Scripture. It is an affair of the soul, an individual relationship of boy and master through Christ with God. *It is also an affair of psychology*. And how many of us trouble about that? Parents, if they are to understand their children, cannot ignore it. There is a cause for everything which reveals itself in the boy's character. Is he suddenly become moody or silent? It is of no use to rebuke him. You must seek the cause, and you will find it perhaps in his physical development or in disappointed pride. Is he a noisy critic of everything and everybody? He has probably received his privileges too easily or

too soon. Is he being tempted? He will be the last person t connect the temptation with, *e.g.* the daily papers. He has 'subliminal self,' invasions from which constantly express them selves in conscious action. Where there is a genuine Christia atmosphere at home, a living religion, a loving home circle, a unselfish consideration for others, there you will find generous reverent-minded, reliable children. Why? Because all tha 'subliminal self' is being built up in Christian surroundings Its promptings are for good. But homes in which religion is one day in the week affair, willingly accepted by the mother reluctantly observed by the father, wherein respectability an luxurious ease and 'having a good time' regardless of other are lamentably patent to the eye, there you have an influenc psychologically disastrous. If this is true, it is clear that school masters must have the sympathy and consciously exercise assistance of parents when preparing boys for Confirmation Do they really seek or get either?

With regard to teaching what are known as Catholic prac tices, such as Confession, Fasting Communion, &c., the funda mental thing to remember is that boys at school must be treate individually and not systematically in such matters. What i good for one may be disastrous for another. But of Confes sion it is my conviction that it should be most sparingly used and that under no circumstances should a schoolmaster ever hea a boy's Confession, *i.e.* a boy in his own school. To do so would be to put the boy in a very false position with regard to his companions as well as the master, and to jeopardize good relationship between the masters themselves.

But there must be *teaching*. A boy must learn the facts of the Christian faith: yet they must be taught without partizan ship. We have all types of boys, with all types of parents Therefore religious instruction must be broad based: but not vague and nebulous. It is difficult to make boys understand more than simple outlines. Show them a picture of Christ crucified, and ask them how that Figure affects their own private life, and see what answers they give! Ask them what is meant by prayer, by redemption, by the Incarnation, by forgiveness, and their very hazy uncertainty will seem astonishing. The great majority of boys believe that our Lord's death saves them —they hardly know from what—by some mechanical, miracu-

lous means. Ask them why Jesus Christ is believed to be divine; they will always answer: 'Because He did such wonderful miracles.' Definite teaching, then, is vital. But what is even more important is that boys should see in their parents' lives that *Christianity affects conduct:* that it means new life; that it is not easily compatible with an unrestricted enjoyment or pursuit of wealth; with mere respectability; with social injustice; with self-advertisement; with 'divorce made easy'; with dishonesty; with complacence towards moral evil: but that it demands courage, adventure, self-effacement, a passionate love of justice, and a practical brotherhood among all men, in Christ. 'If you are not frightened of Christianity,' said the present Bishop of Manchester once, 'you don't know what it is.'

There are two characteristics in boys, in their collective capacity, where the help of parents (for which help I appeal) could effect a great deal. The first is, a curious readiness that many boys acquire to condone dishonesty in work, and occasionally in other things. If parents would help schoolmasters to make boys realize that all dishonesty is bad, poor-spirited, not compatible with the teaching of Christ, and a sin against the 'whole body,' this rather common weakness might be overcome. The second characteristic is, the practically universal *silence* about moral evil if and where it exists. This silence springs from a fine and praiseworthy sense of corporate loyalty, and a justifiable hatred of 'sneaking.' There never must be, nor need be, any 'sneaking.' But if boys can learn to regard themselves as members one of another, and as inflicting injury on or suffering evil in the whole body by tolerating the sin of a few; if they can be made to see that a weak character needs help, not isolation, a great step forward will be made. Boys and parents ought to take a line about moral evil. Parents fuss enough about the germs of measles and mumps! But there are bound to be some germs of vice in any large community. Do they matter less? It ought to be possible for boys to speak about such things to their parents far more courageously than they do. Irreparable disaster can result from a mistaken silence. The period of Confirmation gives to parent and schoolmaster a chance of making faith express itself in conduct. Too often the schoolmaster acts

alone, whereas home influence is the main thing that counts, and only *after* that the personal faith of the master who prepares the boys.

A third factor in the religious education of boys is, the teaching of Divinity. But this does not count for as much as it should. Perhaps the main causes of this are, that Scripture examinations destroy nearly all possibility of teaching what most needs to be taught; that very little time is given to the subject; that it is a subject which seems often to be regarded as being well within the capacity—and the rights—of *anyone* to teach, regardless of his views or faith, or lack of faith. What is needed is a 'free period' or two, during which the Bible and the revelation it contains can be interestingly taught and discussed; and the opportunity of doing this ought to be given to those lay and clerical masters whose personal interest and faith have made them educate themselves in the subject. And there should be no Scripture examinations at all. A 'free period' gives a real chance of discussion between boys and master. The present writer—as no doubt other schoolmasters also—has found a lively interest among boys in such discussions. Questions are freely asked—sometimes unanswerable—such as, 'What happened to Christ's body after death?'—'How could Jesus pray to God if He was God?'—'Why does God allow suffering if He is omnipotent?'—'What is heaven?'—'Do you believe in hell?'—'Why are no miracles performed now?'—'Who wrote the Bible? How do we know it is true?'—'What's the difference between a High and a Low Churchman? Which are you?'—'If God knows what we need, and loves us, why pray?'—&c., &c. These questions came from boys about fifteen years old, which supports, perhaps, the suggestion that at that age they are beginning to be mentally restless and uncertain, during which time it surely is not wise to have them confirmed.

These three factors in the religious education of boys at school—the Services, the period of Confirmation, and the Divinity lessons—are reinforced by other and subsidiary influences, such as occasional lectures, missionary addresses, school festivals, and school missions. Of these it is not necessary to write now, except just to raise the question whether the usual method of 'running' a school mission is always the best

method. It is very hard to awaken in boys a real interest in slum parishes, though they are ready to give whatever they can to help others. But that is not the main object of schools having missions. To give money is not social service, and I do not believe that schoolboys are capable, however desirous they may be, of giving that service in parochial activities. Perhaps it might be a better thing to organize on extensive lines the holding of summer camps? or, if money is subscribed, to help in building continuation schools? However, this is somewhat of a digression. A last and very powerful factor in the building up of a boy's spiritual life is what one may call 'the general tone' of a school: itself a product and an instrument of religion. The boys who seem to produce this right 'tone,' and to stand most resolutely for the Christian point of view, are not, as a rule, the 'pious,' the 'churchy' (if there are any) in a narrow sense, but the simple-hearted, simple-faithed boys who pray regularly, live honourably, purely, because their faith in Christ and their love of home demand this of them. But they come from those all too few homes where Christ is a recognized and reverenced Companion. But this quality of faith is somewhat less common than it was. Perhaps this is due to transient causes. Yet there are many to-day who feel that the new wine is bursting some old bottles, and in the public schools the bursting process is not unknown. Dr. David, lately Headmaster of Rugby, testified at the beginning of this year, at a meeting of Dons and Schoolmasters held at Oxford, to the fact of increasing intellectual restlessness among boys. Complete disbelief is rare. But intellectual unrest there certainly is. What are the causes? They must be very numerous, but the following would appear to be some of them:

(1) Dissatisfaction with what has been called a 'childish theology.' Christian belief is much too often expressed in antiquated phraseology, and misleading terms: *e.g.* Could not the Baptismal Service and the Catechism be changed?

(2) Wrong teaching or no teaching given at home or elsewhere about such things as prayer, the Kingdom of Christ, redemption, the interpretation of parables, &c., &c.

(3) The failure of the Church officially or of Christians

collectively to bear effective witness against social and political evils.

(4) The idea, not infrequently held and ventilated, that Christianity is unpractical, too difficult, and therefore to be ignored.

(5) The scandalous stupidity of divisions among Christians and Churches.

(6) The belief that Christianity deals with the next world rather than with this, and that there is too much insistence laid upon 'rewards and punishments.'

(7) The failure to recognize that religion must express itself in conduct, and that Christianity demands and evokes the highest qualities.

(8) A feeling that all religious enthusiasm is merely 'subjective.'

(9) Fine lives are often led by people who do not pray nor ever enter a church.

These, at any rate, are some of the reasons, good or bad as the case may be, for the criticism and doubt which are noticeable to-day.

Now, one of the great difficulties in dealing with doubt in boys is that in the majority of cases they know so very little. There is hardly any foundation to build on. One plan for meeting this difficulty was suggested at the Conference (alluded to above) by Dr. David and the present Headmaster of Rugby. It was that a meeting should be held at some place—*e.g.* Oxford—in the summer holidays, at which a few lecturers, carefully chosen, should instruct boys over seventeen in the fundamentals of religious belief and thought. There was to be ample opportunity for group discussions, and a real effort was to be made to remove, at any rate, the more common and incipient 'intellectual doubts' by clear, systematic, reasonable teaching. Whether such a plan would succeed or not it is difficult to foretell. But it might well be tried. That some such teaching is necessary is suggested by the two following examples of doubt in older boys. One boy of nineteen admitted that he never prayed, and never had prayed: that he did not believe in it, for what good did it do? The main thing was to do kind actions; that was prayer. But the moment any effort was made to explain to him the reasonableness o

prayer, he was completely at sea. He knew nothing. There was no foundation of religious thought to build on. A second boy, a little younger, remarked one evening to the writer of this paper that he had 'discovered God in the last fortnight.' 'It is none of your Christian God,' he added, 'for, after all, who was Christ?' Pressed to explain further, he said that he 'discovered God' in a lecture we had all recently heard. That lecture was the wonderful story of the stupendous bravery and persistence of those who took part in the Zeebrugge expedition. The lecturer was Captain Carpenter, V.C. And where did God come in? God was 'the Principle that could inspire men to such heroism.' But the boy had no use for what he understood to be 'the Christian God.' Therefore it is clear that he had not the vaguest conception of the fact that in Christ all the finest qualities of heroism and self-effacement and devotion were conspicuous and arresting. Moreover, the moment that an endeavour was made to answer his question as to 'Who was Christ?' he also was all at sea. 'That's much too difficult. Religion must be easier to understand than that. It is a simple thing.' But this awakening of thought is good, and full of promise. The new wine need not be spilt if the Church will trust to the Spirit which 'will guide us into all truth' and make some new bottles. As regards the boys themselves at school, the vital thing is that they should come into contact with men of faith as well as of learning. The trouble is that when in doubt they so often prefer to listen to the negative criticisms of a clever boy or master than to ask the help of those who, striving to believe, have a more constructive outlook on religion. Perhaps they have been told, and to an extent feel, that 'orthodoxy' is wedded to an obsolete theology? What they have got to learn is that all of us are searchers. The thing that matters is, what are we really searching for and in what spirit?

But the real way to overcome doubt is to manifest faith. When Christ was asked a theoretical question, His answer was, 'Strive ye to enter in at the strait gate.' Go and *do* something. If, in the spirit of faith, we try to do the things, we shall learn of the doctrine. Boys must see in their parents and in their masters at school Christianity manifesting itself in their way of living and in their relations with their fellow-men. Let

boys see that Christ's cause—their religion—is bound up on earth with all human ideals: that a chivalrous allegiance rather than an orthodox consent is needed: show them that the Christian faith of men and women is capable of healing the sufferings of the world as no other faith is, by its active working in the varied professions wherein they may find their vocation: that membership of the Church should mean membership in a living organism, vital, redemptive, all-inclusive, with its energies controlled by God and directed towards the righting of human wrong, towards the Kingdom of Christ among men. The ideals of youth are ideals of action. Orthodox Churchmanship is in their eyes and at their age too negative in character, however desirable in practice, to stimulate their collective interest or enthusiasm. Boys reverence Jesus, the Man who did things, far more than the Church which they feel enshrines His memory rather than His life.

Yet the Church ought to be the divine society in which all of us may find the inspiration to serve: for it should be the agent of the Kingdom of God on earth, the perpetual witness to Christ's way of life, the uncompromising enemy of sin in all its disguises, the promoter of brotherhood and love. Until some great luminary of faith arises to re-awaken the Christian Church to the nature of her mission, some movement or some person in whom we can see the enthusiasm of a Wesley, the humanity of a More, the stern evangelism of a Whitefield, the saintliness of a Bishop King, the mental power of a St. Thomas Aquinas, religious life will remain spasmodic, particularist, tepid.

Meanwhile it is our duty to make our homes, wherein private and family prayers, sane and regular Churchmanship, social service, are characteristic marks of our faith, the kind of surroundings in which the re-birth of Christianity may arise. If the parents and God-parents of baptized boys and girls were true to their responsibilities as members of Christ's Church, and lived the life and taught the truth as revealed to them through their own devotion and prayer, is there any doubt but that the re-birth of faith would be witnessed among all men—and not least in the great power-houses of effective energy, the schools of England?

THE PLACE OF MODERNISM IN THE CHURCH

By the Rev. J. R. Cohu, M.A., Rector of Aston Clinton, Bucks; Sometime Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford.

WHAT are the marks of the Modernist? Is there a place for the Modernist in the Church? Can a Modernist consistently and honestly endorse the profession of faith he is called upon to make as a teacher and worshipper in the Church?

I.

What are the marks of a Modernist? Modernism is *not* a question of creed, but of outlook. Modernists hold the same faith as other Christians, but they lay all the stress on the spirit, not the letter of the creeds. Roughly, these are the 'notes' of Modernism:

(*a*) *Modernism distinguishes between Religion and Theology.* Religion is a heart-experience, which theology attempts to formulate in the words, thought and philosophy of its day. Hence 'no formula which expresses clearly the thought of one generation can convey the same meaning to the next.' But how can the experience of the heart be translated into words, heart-faith into creed, spirit into letter? The only possible way is Christ's word-picture speech of poetry or parable: 'Our Father'; 'I am the Vine,' 'the Bread of Life.'

(*b*) *Modernism strives to 'baptize into Christ' all science and culture.* 'It is our duty to learn all that God is teaching us through the studies and discoveries of our contemporaries, whether inside or outside the Church, bending with reverent teachableness to the influence of His Spirit from whatever quarter He may breathe upon us' (*Lambeth Encyc.*, 1908).

(*c*) *Modernism sets Truth above Tradition.* True to the modern historic method, it strives to follow fearlessly wherever facts lead, even in religion, convinced that to dictate to know-

ledge the result at which it is to arrive is to make knowledge impossible. (*cf.* Tait to Temple: 'If the conclusions are prescribed, the study is precluded.')

(*d*) *Modernism is a foe to Sectarianism.* Even as in Apostolic days, so now; the Church must have within her fold different groups of Christians facing truth from different aspects; all knit together in unity of heart and spirit, pooling their 'gifts.' If Christ is to reach all types and varieties of men, His Church must be many-sided. For James or Peter to unchurch Paul, or Paul to cut himself aloof from James or Peter and found a new Church, is treason against the Holy Ghost.

(*e*) *Modernism is opposed to Ecclesiasticism.* Ecclesiasticism takes church-services, sacraments, holy days, creeds, rites, orders—things good in themselves as '*means* of grace' bearing fruit in a holy life—and, by assigning to them an intrinsic value, makes them *ends in themselves.* As Isaiah (i, 10—19) and Christ tell us, this subordination of Gospel values to ecclesiastical values is the deadliest foe of religion (= character and a life of service, *e.g.* St. Mt. vii, 21 *sqq.*).

II.

Is there a place in the Church for the Modernist?

If a refusal to identify religion with theology; a belief in progressive revelation and a growing message abreast of the best thought and aspirations of the day; a yearning to see all children of God knit together in unity of heart and spirit for the work of the Kingdom; an intolerance of ecclesiasticism, are the 'notes' of Modernism, then, clearly, it is essential to the life of the Church, and history proves it. The name is new, but the thing is very old. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, as champions of religion against ecclesiasticism, were Modernists; Christ was a Modernist when he denounced the traditional ecclesiasticism of His day, and, with His 'It hath been said to them of old . . but I say unto you,' cut right across the letter of the Bible on the Sabbath, divorce, adultery, murder, to get at its true spirit. To the Twelve, St. Paul was a Modernist of Modernists (*cf.* Ac. xxi, 21). In our own time, Arnold, Temple, Stanley, Kingsley,

Maurice, Robertson, Farrar, Driver, Sanday (even Gore in *Lux Mundi*), were denounced, reviled, persecuted as pernicious Modernists, yet the very opinions for which they were anathematized are now the possession of all thoughtful Churchmen.

If the Church of Christ is to be comprehensive, she must have a place for Modernists, for the educated laity to-day are steeped in modern thought. We have only to read that admirable book, *Faith and Fear*, to see why 'the Church is not able to win or keep men when they see light and acquire knowledge which it will not (or at least does not) recognize, or recognizing, rejects.' So our educated laity have to go elsewhere to satisfy their spiritual and intellectual needs, and not a few of our churches, especially in the metropolis, are half empty.

But it is not necessary to labour the point. The Church authorities know it, as these three quotations from the Lambeth Conference (1921) Report, which might serve as a charter of Modernism, bear witness:

> 'There is much that the fellowship of the Church lacks for its completeness of life. The tendency to say "the old is good" is particularly strong in the Church. Religious people are apt to feel the goodness of the old so much that they are slow to prove whether there are yet powers of God on which they have never drawn . . . As a result of this, men and women form fellowships that they may do outside the Church what they ought to have had opportunity to do, and to do better, within it' (*Encycl. Letter*, p. 15).

> 'We are profoundly conscious that the Holy Spirit teaches Christian people by those age-long precedents which we believe to be the outcome of His guidance. But sometimes it becomes our duty, faithfully retaining the lessons of the sacred past, in a very special sense to trust ourselves to His inspiration in that present which is our time of opportunity, in order that He may lead us into whatever fresh truth of thought or of action is in accordance with the will of God. For the Holy Spirit is with us and our generation no whit less than He was with our elder brethren in Christ in the first days of the Gospel' (*Lambeth Report*, p. 95).

> 'It will not do for us merely to repeat time-honoured formulae. We have to state, and to state in terms which are real and convincing to the mind of our time, the fundamental truths of the Christian revelation. And the one and only condition on which these truths become convincing is that the statement of them should be enriched by all knowledge available to-day. As has been said of Origen, so it must always be said of the guardians of the Faith: "His faith was catholic and therefore he welcomed every kind of knowledge as tributary to its fulness." We are able wholeheartedly and without shrinking to welcome research, criticism, scientific investigation: we are ready to accept conclusions to the extent and within the limits which scientific reasoning and methods authorize' (*Ibid.*, p. 118).

III.

Can a Modernist consistently and honestly endorse the professions of Faith he is called upon to make as a teacher and worshipper in the Church, especially the assent to Scripture?

To-day modern scholarship compels even the most orthodox to question many Biblical statements. In the Old Testament, books claim to be written by Moses, David, Solomon, which are not theirs; statements are made which are not facts (*e.g.* a six-day creation); poetry is turned into prose (*e.g.* sun standing still); miracles abound (*e.g.* iron axes float, an ass spoke); hymns of hate are frequent, and immoral acts are done as if by God's orders (*e.g.* wholesale butchery of captives); history is written with a moral (*e.g.* Kings) or ecclesiastical bias (*e.g.* Chronicles). Some of these tendencies, less pronounced, are seen in the New Testament. Truth of idea is often put above truth of fact, *e.g.* that gem of the Gospels, St. John, is idealized history; it assumes a knowledge of the other Gospels and brings out the spiritual meaning their facts enshrine; fact and letter are sacrificed to edification and spirit; the pithy sayings of our Lord are now theological meditations; all the miracles are 'acted parables' with a transparent spiritual meaning. It is history written (80—100 A.D.) in the light of long meditation and preaching on the inner meaning of our Lord's person and teaching.

Now, is this 'edifying history' quite absent from the other three Gospels? They are of priceless historical value, especially St. Mark, the earliest and most historical, which the other two embody in theirs. But how and when were they written? Of Mark, Bishop Papias (125 A.D.) tells us: 'Mark, having become interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately everything he remembered. For neither did he hear the Lord, nor follow Him; but afterwards, as I said, (followed) Peter, who adapted his instruction to the needs (of his hearers).' Thus these Gospels are written largely, not at first hand or from notes taken during the ministry, but on apostolic teaching and preaching,[1]

[1] Matthew and Luke use Mark as their backbone, also the Matthæan *Logia* (Q) of 55 A.D., and here and there private sources.

and thirty to fifty years after the events. Edification was the aim of the preaching, but it was also apologetic, *i.e.* not a mere record of facts, but of proofs (from Scripture) of Christ's Messiahship, as against Jewish and pagan opponents. We see this in all the New Testament, *e.g.* St. Matthew's main aim is to show how all the threads of Old Testament prophecy are gathered together in Christ, and some of his proofs are very forced (*e.g.* ii, 15; xxi, 3—7). Now, as St. John shows, history written on edifying and apologetic lines makes it more spiritual, but sacrifices truth of fact to truth of idea. It does not leave the record exactly as it found it. We can trace at least three distinct stages of this 'growth of tradition' in (1) Mark, (2) Matthew and Luke, and (3) John. Thus, note how Mark's limitation of our Lord's healing power (i, 34; vi, 5), His strong emotions (iii, 5; x, 14; xiv, 33), His being 'beside Himself' (iii, 21), His refusal to be called 'good,' are toned down or suppressed in Matthew and Luke. At the tomb the women in Mark see 'a young man in white . . . and they were amazed and fled trembling,' and told no one; in Luke 'two men in dazzling apparel' re-assured them and they went and 'told all these things to the Eleven and to all the rest'; in Matthew, there is a great earthquake, and an angel of the Lord (see in xxviii, 3, his 'dazzling' glory) comforted them and 'they departed with fear and great joy and ran to bring His disciples word.' Exactly the same 'growing' tradition meets us in the Confession of Peter, the sayings on the Cross, the Resurrection appearances, as told in Mark, Matthew and Luke, and John. So, too, we have three views of our Lord's Person, 'the Adoptionist Christology of the First Church at Jerusalem, the pre-existent Christology of St. Paul, and the Logos Christology of St. John'; we also find different views of the mode of Christ's birth.

If space permitted, it would be the easiest thing to multiply divergences of tradition in the New Testament, *e.g.* Luke's conception in Acts of the Twelve as an Apostolic College at Jerusalem, directing the whole Church, commissioning Paul and directing his movements, a notion flatly contradicted by Paul himself in Gal. i, ii; even as Luke's representation of 'tongues'

(Acts ii) as power to speak *foreign* languages clashes with Paul's description of 'tongues' in I Cor. Again, in St. Luke xxiv the Ascension takes place on the day of the Resurrection, while in Acts i he puts it at the end of the forty days, a new fact of which no other New Testament writer has any knowledge; just as no other writer (apart from the spurious conclusion of St. Mark) knows anything of a *visible* Ascension. Strangest of all are the divergences in the Lord's Prayer and the words of the Last Supper. Worth noting, too, as a possible side-light on miracles, is the way in which parable or symbolism is turned into literal reality; *e.g.* our Lord's symbolic word-picture of the Temptation is taken literally in the Gospels; and a barren fig-tree parable is turned into the cursing and withering of a fig-tree by our Lord disappointed not to find figs on it, though 'the time of figs was not yet'! St. John's 'acted parable' miracles seem to bear out this view.

If our Gospels are not scientifically accurate history, are they, then, unreliable? Far from it. To begin with, our modern conception of history, with its exacting demand for accuracy, is but some fifty years old, the child of our scientific age and methods. Even great historians like Thucydides and Tacitus place fictitious speeches, as do St. Luke and St. John, in the mouths of their characters. All early history is essentially artistic, and written with a moral or political purpose. Moreover, even if the Gospel-writers had had our scientific training, instead of the reverse, they might have given us more accurate facts, but they would never have given us the living picture of the Christ which is ours to-day through their having written exactly as they did. It is just their bold strokes which give us the immense total impression our Lord made on men, a conviction of One so superhuman that no man's words can express it. Whatever inaccuracies of detail the Gospels may contain, they give us a portrait of Christ such as no modern historian could produce. We have but to steep ourselves in their atmosphere, catch their spirit to-day to see in their pages the Christ as they saw Him and say with them: 'Thou art the Christ of God!'

None the less, the human element peeps through the Bible, Old and New. It is a Bible both divine and human. Divine

for in it the voice of God's Holy Spirit speaks to us through these holy men. Human, for in it God's message comes to us in and through man, and coloured by the human mind through which it passes, reflecting the mental and moral atmosphere of the age and place of its birth. Hence the Bible contains God's word, but all of it is not God's word. 'We have this treasure in earthen vessels.'

Therefore, if it is a sin, as Christ tells us (Mt. xix, 8), to live by a lower truth when the higher is ours, we can no longer endorse Old or New Testament ideas which we have outgrown (*e.g.* heaven as a place above the sky, disease as the work of demons), and if we are to worship God 'in spirit and in truth,' 'with the spirit, but with the understanding also,' then we must 'prove all things and hold fast that which is good.' The Church makes Scripture her final court of appeal; so do we, but the appeal to-day can no longer be to the letter of the Bible; it can only be to the true message and real evidence of Scripture. In this sense, and in this sense only, can we answer 'Yes' to the question in 'the Ordering of deacons': 'Do you unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament? Neither Christ nor Paul (see II *sup.*, first paragraph) could say an unqualified 'I do believe them' to that question, and such a demand to-day would unfrock nine-tenths of the bishops and two-thirds of the clergy. No reformed Church has the least right to ask the question in that form.

So of the three creeds; for Art. viii places them all on the same level. They stand or fall on Scriptural grounds: 'they ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.' Clearly, then, as with the Scriptures, we must interpret them in the spirit and not the letter. For instance, are we to say to-day, without mental reservation, 'I believe,' of the clauses 'He descended into hell,' 'He ascended into heaven,' just because the Church took over *en bloc* the Scriptural conception of heaven as a place above the skies, and of hell as a place beneath the earth, as a truth not only hallowed, but for ever fixed? So of the 'resurrection of the body.' In I Thess. iv,, 16 *sq.*, St. Paul endorses the resurrection of the body; in I Cor. 15, it is still a resurrection of the body, but as transfigured as the flower is

to the seed, for 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of Heaven'; in II Cor. 5, he no longer believes in the resurrection of the body in any shape or form, at the moment of death we pass into heaven and our spirit-body is awaiting us there. At this last stage, could St. Paul have said unreservedly: 'I believe in the resurrection of the body' (or 'flesh,' as in the Baptismal service and in the original creed)? So of the Virgin Birth: St. John and St. Paul never mention it, yet they were most careful in instructing their Churches in all the essentials of the faith. St. Paul actually insists that 'Jesus Christ our Lord was made of the seed of David according to the flesh,' thus clearly pre-supposing Joseph as His father (St. Mt. i, 16). And if Mary knew her Son's miraculous birth, is it not passing strange that she and His relatives thought Him 'beside Himself' (Mk. iii, 21), thus inducing Jesus to disown His family (iii, 31 *sqq.*). Scripture gives us a normal and an abnormal Birth of Christ.[2] Is it essential to salvation that we should choose the one and reject the other, or that we should know for certain Christ's mode of entry into the world?

Modernists believe as fully and whole-heartedly as others in the Incarnation of our Lord, His unique Sonship and Divinity, His real and sinless Manhood; His Resurrection; the spiritual activity on which He then entered: they endorse the essential truths enshrined in each of the clauses of the creed, but they refuse to be tied down to the letter of the clauses. Even Dr. Gore and his school act on this principle for some clauses of the creed; why not for others? Creeds based on Scripture must be interpreted in accordance with our modern Scriptural knowlege. Either we must re-write our creeds in accordance with our best modern thought and knowledge, or, if we keep the old creeds, men must be told to look to their spirit, not their letter. Since 1865, our Church tells us so. Nowhere does she ask for an absolute assent to creeds, as to Scripture. Besides the Scripture test, the only other is the general assent to the

[2] If Mary's virginity is needed to safeguard Christ's sinlessness, we cannot stop there. To 'cut off the entail of sin' Mary's mother, and her mother, and so on right back to Eve, must have been born sinless, *i.e.* virgin-born.

XXXIX Articles, Prayer Book and Ordinal. Till 1865, it was 'an unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything' in the Prayer Book, and 'to all and everyone' of the Articles. These rigid clauses are now deleted, and, as Dr. Gore says, it 'expresses only a general assent,' *i.e.* it admits of liberty of interpretation. This is all we ask for in the creeds, a liberty which a right reading of Scripture more than justifies.

* * * * *

All these are questions of life and death to the Church. Through misconception on these points our best and ablest University men, eminently qualified for Orders, refuse to pledge themselves to assents they cannot endorse, though well aware that many of the clergy subscribe the Articles tongue in cheek, and deliberately set at nought the anti-Romanizing spirit on which our Reformed Church, her Articles and Prayer Book, are wholly built. This vital question concerns the laity equally. To the creeds they, too, in the services say 'I believe,' and 'all this I steadfastly believe' in the Baptismal service. Here again, many say it with qualms of conscience, others rebel and stay outside the Church. It is common knowledge that a large and well-organized wing of our Church, as a counterblast to the Girton Conference, is pledging itself to an ultimatum: 'Either recite the creeds in their literal sense as they stand, or go.' Now, there is a real *either—or* before us, but quite another: *Either* the Church must march forward loyal to the Spirit guiding unto all truth, *or* die. To-day, as in the days of Maurice, Kingsley, Arnold, Temple, it is pioneers that count. The late Bishop of Lincoln, speaking in Convocation in 1914, was right:

> 'The men who may be called the English modernists are not unsettling the Faith, but interpreting and making it clearer to the modern man. Within a generation they will be looked back to as men who helped to build up the Faith of the English Church.'

CHRISTIAN REUNION FROM THE QUAKER POINT OF VIEW

By Edward Grubb, M.A.

A HOPEFUL feature of the religious life of the present day is the widespread and deeply-felt desire for the healing of divisions among Christian people. Their separation in different organizations, where they have no obvious common life, can speak with no common voice, and are sometimes in acute disagreement with one another, is felt to destroy the very meaning of a Church, which should be the fellowship of all genuine disciples of Christ. On the foreign mission field, in particular, the absurdity has long been felt of proclaiming various brands of Christianity, and reproducing among the peoples of India and China and Japan divisions which to them are for the most part without meaning. The movement towards re-union has received a powerful impetus from the war, because of the failure of a divided Christendom to hold up before the nations their duties to one another, and guide the peoples in the way of peace.

The many proposals for re-union, whether smaller or larger, start for the most part with a double aim—that of finding a common creed and agreeing on a common organization. Such, apparently, is held to be the essence of re-union. A 'visible' Church is thought to consist of persons who define their religious beliefs by the same formulae, and express their Christian life through the same institutions. Since nearly all divisions have come about through failure to agree about one or both of these two things, Belief and Organization, it is perhaps natural that efforts for re-union should put them in the foreground. One of the most ambitious of these movements, that which is preparing for a 'World Conference on Faith and Order,' and which held a preliminary Conference at Geneva in August, 1920, shows by its very title that its promoters consider agreement on 'faith' and 'order' to be the first object at which to aim.

The main purpose of this article is to question that assumption, and to inquire whether there is not a deeper and much more essential condition of re-union, which is being to a large extent overlooked. But, in order to deal with this, it seems needful in the first place to ask: What is a Church?—and this raises the still more fundamental question: What is Christianity? For it is obvious that, if efforts after re-union are to be wisely conducted, there should be a clear understanding of what it is we are trying to unite, and what is the nature of the material with which we have to deal. The second and more fundamental question will be dealt with first.

It is in the light of history that answers to these questions must be looked for. The real nature of the Church, and of the Christianity that produced it, will be best gathered if we look back to the first century, when both were at their purest and brightest. Let us glance at the presentation of Christianity in one of the latest writings of that century. From near its close has come down to us the first Johannine Epistle, in which the writer endeavours to fortify his fellow-disciples against moral and intellectual dangers that were already threatening their Christian life. With intense earnestness, and some reiteration, he offers them tests of true Christianity. His first and primary test has nothing to do with either belief or organization, but is purely ethical. It is 'walking in the light' (i, 5—7), 'keeping the commandments' of Jesus (ii, 3—6)—specially and inclusively the commandment of love to men (ii, 7—11). 'We know that we have passed out of death into life because we love the brethren' (iii, 14); 'love is of God, and every one that loveth is begotten of God and knoweth God' (iv, 7); 'if we love one another, God abideth in us' (iv, 12).

This is a test of Christianity which the Church has rarely thought of applying, though the world does it effectively enough. For the writer, Christianity meant in the first instance *an inward experience* of the God who was love, and who had manifested His character in the human life and sacrificial death of Jesus (iv, 9, 10). It was, secondly, *a way of life* based on that experience of God in Jesus. 'We love, because He first loved us' (iv, 19). Jesus had died for men, but He had con-

quered death, and was re-living His own life of love in the souls of His faithful followers. 'Hereby know we that He abideth in us, by the Spirit which He gave us' (iii, 24).

The primary test, then, of real Christianity is ethical—it is the experience, the presence, and the practice of love. But, since this experience in its fulness has come to men through Jesus, there is, bound up with it, another test of a more intellectual character—that of *true thoughts* concerning Jesus Christ. 'Who is the liar, but he that denieth that Jesus *is the Christ?*' (ii, 22; *cf.* iv, 15; v, 1). 'Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ *is come in the flesh* is of God' (iv, 2). The new experience of God, which had flooded the souls of these first Christians with light and love, had come to them through His manifestation in human form; and this, of necessity, raised the question: Who and what was Jesus? As against the Jewish Ebionites, who were content to regard Him as prophet and law-giver, the writer insists that He must be recognized as more than that—as the Christ, the Son of God. As against the Greek Docetists, who inclined to regard His humanity as a mere appearance, he presses with equal force for recognition that he was bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh.[1] The actual humanity of Jesus is to the writer just as vital as His true divinity. Unless Jesus was in some real sense divine, His sacrificial love would not necessarily be a revelation of the character of God; but unless He really became man, with all the limitation this involves, the divine self-sacrifice would be incomplete. Such would seem to have been the writer's thoughts. And so far, but no further, his second test is theological. He never separates it from the first, as though true 'doctrine' could be held apart from real experience and sound practice. In ch. iv, 15, 16, the two tests are brought together, and the confession that 'Jesus is the Son of God' is almost identified with 'abiding in love.'

Further, these true thoughts about Jesus are never imposed as dogma, to be accepted simply on authority. The only authority appealed to is that of God, who is 'light,' and whose

[1] This is clear, not only from ch. iv, 2 (quoted above), but from the opening words of the Epistle, and it may be the point of the allusion to His coming 'by water and blood' in ch. v, 6, especially if this has reference to the 'blood and water' of John xix, 34, 35.

light shines in the souls of those who walk in it, in so far as their eyes are 'being cleansed' by the 'blood of Christ' from the mud of sin (i, 7). The truth is self-evidencing for those who obey it. A Christian is one in whom Jesus by His Spirit is re-living His divine life of love, and who consequently gives to Jesus His rightful place as the communicator of this life to men. The theological test is secondary and subordinate to the ethical.

As to tests of an external character, such as membership in a visible Church, nothing of the kind is even mentioned. There is no allusion to baptism, or to a rightly ordered ministry. By the end of the century such thoughts were in the ascendant, and the writings of Ignatius show the place which, within a few years, they gained in certain sections of the Church. It can hardly be by accident that they are here ignored, nor can we be satisfied with the suggestion that they are taken for granted. Had the writer regarded these things as Ignatius did, he could not have passed them over. Though he never alludes to the 'Church,' the term 'brother' shows what was in his thoughts. The body of true disciples is a 'brotherhood,' a family, a fellowship, bound into one by worship of a common Lord, by a common experience and a common life—the life of love to Him, to one another, and to the men for whom His life was given. The unity for which (as he reports) Jesus prayed is not the unity of those who are encircled by an outward fence of creeds and sacraments. It is a unity like that of Jesus with His Father (John xvii, 21—22)—a unity of mind and will and purpose—the unity that comes of having His quality, His character, His devotion, reproduced in themselves. 'The glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them, that they may be one.'[2]

The upshot, then, of this enquiry into first-century Christianity, as it is presented in the Johannine writings, is that the Christian Church was the fellowship of those who were united to their Lord by the reception of His Spirt into their souls, and by allowing Him to reproduce in them His own

[2] The 'glory' was the victory gained by obedience even unto death, but it could only be achieved as it was imparted to others. 'I am glorified *in them.*'

life of love and dedicated service of men. The writer does not assume that their unity will be preserved by organization. What he does take for granted is that Christ will manifest Himself unmistakably in lives that are surrendered to Him, that loyalty to Him and the re-living of His life of love will distinguish Christians from 'the world' and keep them in unity of life and character. And this is in harmony with the teaching of Jesus as recorded in the Synoptics, where there is no sign that He gave any thought whatever to the organization of His followers into a 'visible' Church.

It may, I think, be urged with much force that the misfortunes and divisions of the Christian Church are due to the loss of the Spirit, and to the endeavour to preserve its purity by verbal definitions and the perfecting of its outer framework. It is precisely this endeavour that has failed. The citadel of truth cannot be guarded by a wire entanglement of creeds and ceremonies and ordered ministry. The effort so to preserve it, when the spirit and the life are lacking, intensifies the evils it sets out to cure. All the worst divisions in the Church turn precisely on these external matters of verbal definition and rigid order. When the Christian spirit is in abeyance, rigidity of organization turns into tyranny, the dead hand of tradition paralyses life, and any fresh upspringings of the Spirit can only seek for freedom through revolt and separation.

Clear thinking, indeed, has always been needed and always will be; and life will always express itself through some form of organization. Let the Church leaders who have the needed intellectual equipment by all means devote their best powers to thinking out what Christianity is and means, to discovering and formulating what is implied in the religious experience that informs the Church. Let them co-operate heartily in devising and re-moulding, as changed conditions demand it, such organization as will give the largest freedom and the strongest cohesion to the spiritual life of their fellow-members. But let them beware of the divisive spirit that creeps in if they seek to be 'lords over God's heritage,' and to keep it in their own way by excluding all who differ from them. It is the spirit of exclusion and excommunication that has always proved so deadly. Why should the better thought embodied in the creeds (on the

assumption that it *was* the better) unchurch the worse, whether Arian or Nestorian or Monophysite? Why not rather seek, in humility and love, to 'expound the way of God more carefully,' as Priscilla and Aquila did to Apollos (Acts xviii, 24—28)? Why need one order of ministry deny reality to others constituted in a different way? Why need persons irregularly baptized, or not baptized at all with water, yet in whom the Spirit of Christ is manifestly at work, be ruled out of His Church?

In reply, it may be argued that clear thinking and wise action demand precise definition; that we are bound to present to our minds as exactly as possible the concepts we are using, and therefore to exclude that which does not come within the definitions we have framed. It may be objected that I am pleading for blurred and hazy thought, in which no word stands for anything that can be clearly marked. That is not so. What I am pleading for is reality, and the nearer we come to reality the more we find that precise definitions fail us. The exactly defined terms with which men argue represent abstractions and not realities. The world of real things, of living things especially, is one in which classes fade into one another by infinite gradations. Most of all is this the case when we are dealing not so much with objects as with persons, and with the great moral and spiritual values which give to persons their significance. The more clearly and exhaustively, for example, we study the facts that go to form the meaning of the word 'Christian,' the less we shall be able to define it precisely by any form of words. The attempt to do so, which necessarily involves the attempt to exclude all that is not within the definition, lands us in unreality.

Such considerations appear to be overlooked by most of those who are concerned in the movements for re-union. So long as these are based, even tacitly and unconsciously, on the desire to exclude, they are bound to fail. Representative Anglicans and Nonconformists meet together, and evolve, with legitimate rejoicing, certain statements of belief on which they can all agree. But what about devout Christians, whether in or out of the bodies so represented, who cannot honestly subscribe to these formulae? In a re-union on a credal basis, are

they to be left out in the cold? The Anglican Bishops, met at Lambeth in 1920, state that 'we acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ *and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity*, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church.' What about the persons baptized under a different formula, as were those of whom we read in the Acts of the Apostles, or (like the Quakers) never outwardly baptized at all? The latter appear to be deliberately shut out, though a late Bishop of Oxford testified of them that they manifested in no small degree the fruits of the Spirit. Insignificant in numbers they no doubt are; but what matters is the principle at stake. A Church enclosed by a ring-fence so formed as to shut out even one true Christian is not really Catholic, and may prove a hindrance to real unity.

Many, perhaps, would say that a re-united Church, even if imperfect, which all things human are bound to be, would be better that one divided as at present. I venture to suggest that, if it is founded on a basis of exclusion, it may well be worse. The larger it is, the greater is the danger to dissident minorities—in whom, as history shows, the Spirit may be actively at work. Under present conditions, bodies whose members 'profess and call themselves Christians,' but are regarded by the rest as unorthodox—whether on matters of belief, like the Unitarians, or on matters of practice, like the Quakers—can maintain their spiritual life in fellowship with one another without feeling that they are altogether excluded from the Christian fold. They feel themselves to be Christian Nonconformists of a rather extreme type. But this would not be so if they were shut out from a Church which was generally regarded as Catholic, and was united on a basis of creeds and forms which they honestly consider to be no part of real and primitive Christianity. A truly Catholic Church must include all who feel themselves to be fundamentally Christian, even if their understanding of Christianity appears to the majority to be imperfect.

The Quakers have often been regarded, on the mission field and elsewhere, as an obstacle to re-union, because they persist, in opposition to nearly all the rest, in their objection to outward sacraments and a separated ministry. But this

opposition, if it is maintained in a spirit that is Christian and not contentious, may prove to be of the greatest value in preventing wrong steps being taken. By standing firmly to their convictions they have already, in a few cases, been able to hinder the erection of fences where there should be none—to obtain a broadening of the basis of re-union through recognition of the reality of Christian life apart from its customary forms. In Madagascar, and to some extent in western China, the 'Friends' have been strong enough to secure that their native members shall be received as Christians by other Churches (when, for instance, they move into a different locality), though they have never been baptized with water and do not take the outward communion. Unfortunately, this was only possible because in these mission fields the Quakers were a strong minority. At Kikuyu (East Africa), being a negligible quantity, they were unable to prevent a federation of Churches being carried out on the usual basis of creeds and sacraments.

The thesis which I wish to maintain is that re-union shall be approached from within and not from without—not by cleverly devising formulae and methods that may secure a superficial uniformity of beliefs and practices, but by recognizing our common life and allowing it to find its natural expression. *Unity must precede Union.* When we all mean the same thing—as, to a large extent, is the case with Protestant Christians on the mission field—unity is achieved; and, since division is then felt to be intolerable, some form of real union will without great difficulty be found. If it is the natural expression of true unity, it will be framed in no exclusive spirit, and will not rule out those who ought to be included.

Unity is not a condition that has to be, or can be, artificially created. It arises naturally in the souls of those who open their inward eyes to the truth of God, who follow the same Lord, who share the experience of His light and love. As William Penn wrote: 'The humble, meek, merciful, just, pious and devout souls are everywhere of one religion; and when death has taken off the mask they will know one another, though the divers liveries they wear here makes them strangers.' 'This,' wrote another Quaker mystic, Isaac Penington, 'is the true ground of love and unity, not that such a man walks and

does just as I do, but that I feel the same spirit and life in him.' Such unity is already present, in germ at least, underlying our differences of creed and administration; and what we have to do is to open our eyes to it, bring it out into clear consciousness, and act upon it. The Bishops at Lambeth show, in their Encyclical Letter, that they are aware of this. They say:

> 'In this appeal we urge them (Christian people) to try a new approach to re-union; to adopt a new point of view; to look up to the reality as it is in God. The unity which we seek exists. It is in God, who is the perfection of unity, the one Father, the one Lord, the one Spirit, who gives life to the one Body. Again, the one Body exists. It needs not to be made, nor to be re-made, but to become organic and visible. Once more, the fellowship of the members of the one Body exists. It is the work of God, not of man. We have only to discover it, and to set free its activities.'

If the Bishops are right, as surely they are here, the path to re-union is not to try, in the first instance, to find a common basis of creed and ceremony and ministerial orders, but to recognize that the real basis lies much deeper, in the underlying unity, and to lay on this the primary emphasis. We must get to know one another better, in the localities where we live, and find how much we have in common, how much there is to learn from those who differ from us. Such intercourse as is made possible by the Student Christian Movement, and the Interdenominational Summer Schools at Swanwick, is of priceless value. We must read one another's books, and see how the honest study of the same facts brings us to similar conclusions. We must study the writings of the saints and mystics, Catholic as well as Protestant, and discover the common experience which they all share and of which they are all exponents. A great poem like *The Hound of Heaven* 'reaches the witness' in us all, and it never occurs to us to ask what particular brand of Christianity its author bore. And, still more, we must discover, and co-operate in, our common work for the Kingdom of God among men; it is this, more than anything, that has brought together the Churches on the mission field.

To seek thus for re-union by mutual education in unity may be a slow path, but it is a sure one, and it will not lead us astray. Already we are discovering that we are much nearer

to each other than we knew. We read each other's expositions of the Bible and of religious history, and find that in the disinterested pursuit of truth, whatever difference there may be in detail, in essentials most of us are at one. We discover that it is opinions and practices that divide, while facts and truth unite. In the light of unbiassed study of primitive Christianity, even the chasm that yawns between Orthodox and Unitarian is perhaps finding its bridge.

To wait for corporate re-union till we have found our unity with one another may seem intolerable to those whose minds are set on a 'visible' Church. But to frame an artificial body for a life that is not there is to re-enact the errors of the past; the body is bound to go to pieces. Life produces organization; organization can never produce life.

MODERNISM AND RECONSTRUCTION

By the Rev. Francis E. Powell, Rector of Ladbroke, Co-Editor of *The Hebrew Prophets for English Readers.*

I. *The Call for Reconstruction.*

1. Never since the conversion of Europe did it seem so possible that the civilized world as a whole might repudiate every form of organized Christianity. C. H. S. Matthews.

2. The Romans ceased to believe, and in losing their faith, they became what steel becomes when it is demagnetized. The spiritual quality was gone out of them, and the high society of Rome itself became a society of powerful animals with an enormous appetite for pleasure. J. A. Froude.

3. All our mighty achievements are being hampered and often neutralized . . . all our social diseases are being aggravated by this supreme and dominant fact—that we have suffered our religion to slide from us . . . The urgent task of our time is to recover a religious faith as a basis of life, both personal and social. Frederick Harrison.

4. It is not so much that traditionalism has been disproved —I do not know that witchcraft or astrology has been dis-

proved—or that it is no longer accepted by persons of education; it is rather that the mental climate has changed to such an extent that it is impossible that the traditional position should now be held. ALFRED FAWKES.

5. Religion was once the pillar of fire which went before the human race in its great march through history, showing it the way. Now, alas, it is fast assuming the rôle of the ambulance which follows in the rear and picks up the exhausted and wounded. This, indeed, is a great work, but it is not sufficient. And when religion has disburdened itself of all its dead values, it will once more, in ultimate association with ethics, rise to be a power which leads men onwards. H. HÖFFDING.

6. Religion suffers more from its stupid friends than from its lively enemies. BENJAMIN DISRAELI.

7. The blame (for destroying men's faith) would be more fittingly attached to those teachers who lead men to rest their faith in God and duty on a foundation of falsehood, which every new wave of thought is sweeping away.

BISHOP COLENSO.

8. It is awful to realize that when one stands up to preach Christ, the soldier feels that one is defending a whole ruck of obsolete theories and antiquated muddles. It is all so much barbed wire through which one has to climb before one finds the heart. G. A. STUDDERT-KENNEDY.

9. The great danger to Christianity is not the open attack, but the silent desertion of intelligent men who go away for lack of instruction which they can understand or accept.

DR. KIRSOPP LAKE.

10. The brazen serpent healed men once, and the Lord Himself took it as a parable of His saving work; but Hezekiah destroyed it all the same, and he called it Nehushtan (a [mere] thing of brass). He called it just what it was; a brazen thing that man had made and God had used . . . Men fancied they were defending God when they defended it, and worshipping God when they really worshipped it. And the living Lord was no more listened to while men had this fetish.

E. A. EDGHILL.

11. Tremendous is the responsibility of the Churches. For in them, despite their frequent lack of insight, their narrowness of outlook, is concentrated and guarded the flower of the spiritual experience of the race. And speedily would they yield a regenerating influence in the social and intellectual movements that surge around them, if they could but generously respond to the call of the future. To be loyal to the past is noble; to be loyal to the future is yet more noble. But for those who grasp the principle of continuity, the antagonism is softened if not abolished. They see that what has been cannot ever simply persist. It furnishes the materials out of which, by a higher biology (call it dialectical, spiritual, or what you will), are built up ever more complex forms and ever loftier ideals. BISHOP MERCER.

12. It would be a strange and almost incredible thing that the Gospel, which at the first made war only on the vices of mankind, should now be opposed to one of the highest and rarest of human virtues—the love of truth. And that in the present day the great object of Christianity should be, not to change the lives of men, but to prevent them from changing their opinions: that would be a singular inversion of the purposes for which Christ came into the world. B. JOWETT.

13. Each generation must do its own seeking and finding. The fathers' having found is only the warrant for the children's search. GEORGE MACDONALD.

14. The theological machinery, that spoke so livingly to our ancestors, with its finite age of the world, its creation out of nothing, its juridical morality and eschatology, its relish for rewards and punishments, its treatment of God as an external contriver, sounds as odd to most of us as if it were some outlandish rude religion. WILLIAM JAMES.

15. To me, at any rate, the disgust and weariness of Christianity, which is so common among some of the best men and women of the day, is the most wasteful, the most uncalled-for, surrender of its own wealth that modern life can make . . . Is not the *real* difficulty that we will not take a certain trouble —that we will not (even for our children's sake, or the sake of those, perhaps, of another class, whose starved education we,

more fortunate and more responsible, may long to help from our own) go through a certain drudgery which must be faced if the old Christianity is ever to become in us something once more new and living? . . . The matter is not so complex, not so difficult, as our timidity or indolence believes. The material which we have is amply enough, if we could only use it to the best of our ability, and, so far as we can, as we are constantly using the available materials for judgments in other departments of our life. MRS. HUMPHRY WARD.

16. To live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often. J. H. NEWMAN.

17. Entre une religion unintelligente et un matérialisme brutal, âme poetique et pure, où serait ta place? RENAN.

II. *The Possibilities of Reconstruction.*

1. So far from being effete, Christianity is only beginning to be developed. A. P. STANLEY.

2. It needs no prophet to foresee that the time will come when ideas, which to-day are strange and unwelcome, will be seen to possess a beauty of their own, to be necessary to the completeness of truth, and to belong, no less than many which are long familiar, to the common treasury of the Kingdom of God. DR. H. B. SWETE.

3. A purified and enlarged Christianity is destined to be the religion of humanity. ANON.

4. Religion is not dead, but hibernating as preparatory to a new metamorphosis. Our race is on the way, through a somewhat bleak transition stage, to a higher altitude, and a more advanced spiritual development, where the secret yearnings of the soul, at present so feebly supported by reason, shall find as clear a scientific sanction as they will a full inward realization. J. BRIERLEY.

5. Christianity is being steadily purified of all its incongruous and foreign adhesions. Time, the silent one, is continually disapproving the falsities that have crept into its systems and weakened its influence. And the process will

continue until religion, standing simply for its own essential truth and life, diverted of all that science and criticism can assail, will wield over the whole field of affairs, with unrestricted sweep, its one irresistible weapon—the sword of the Spirit.

J. Brierley.

6. In these days some of the outward and traditional modes of religious expression and communion do not seem to make the same appeal, whether by way of attraction or by way of obligation, even to seriously-minded Englishmen, that they used to do. But . . . there is no evidence whatever to show that Christian ideals have grown less powerful and more dim.

H. H. Asquith.

7. As soon as the forces of the New Reformation have grown strong enough, it is believed that Christian faith and modern science will unite to quicken the heart and mind of humanity, and lift it, on a wave of common joy and hope, into a nobler life.

F. Fort Newton.

8. The Saviour of the world extends His arms towards the cultivated modern man just as He does towards the simple believer. Believe that the cultivated modern man may enter the Church of Christ with his head erect . . . that he can afford to say what he really thinks, provided only his fellow-Christians of more traditional types are willing to greet him with the sympathetic intelligence which he deserves, and do not turn towards him the cold shoulder of suspicion and denunciation.

Dr. Sanday.

9. One result of this study—(of the beginnings of Christianity, of all the conditions of life and thought, of popular piety and theological and philosophical speculation, in the midst of which the earliest interpretations of the facts of our Lord's life, and of the great stream of religious experience which had its spring in those facts, were fashioned)—is that the Christian student is much more sure of the reality of this religious experience, and of the impression produced by our Lord, of this 'impact' on the world, than he is of the ways in which that impression was produced.

Dr. Bethune-Baker.

10. Christianity is at the cross-roads to-day, but what is often forgotten is that it has often been at the cross-roads before. The historical study of Christianity shows that the conception of a fixed, stereotyped, unchanging Christianity is a mere myth. The history of Christianity exhibited it as a progressive effort to adjust the ideal of life revealed by its Founder to the facts of existence as realized by experience and as formulated by science. The process had been needful and profitable . . . There was nothing in this change which need in any way modify the fundamental conception of the Personality of God, or of the directness and immediacy of the Divine action, or of the closeness of the communion which human souls might enjoy with Him. DEAN RASHDALL.

11. They speak perhaps more truly than they know who tell us that for the English Church the time in which we live is critical, that she has come to the parting of the ways. For the larger call is in her ears: she may hear it, and follow; or she may be deaf to it, and refrain. In other words, she may resign herself to the distinctive and denominational position of a mere Anglicanism, or she may rise to her higher calling and stand for English Christianity as a whole. In the former case . . . . she will rest on her past; she will appeal to the stationary elements of society—the unthinking, the unintelligent, those who for one reason or another stand outside the main stream of life . . . But this road leads nowhere. A Church which takes it may be long in dying, but is on the road to die. In the other case, a great, a very great destiny awaits her—the furtherance of the religious life of the English people at home and beyond the seas . . . She may unite . . . the best elements both of the old order and of the new. Should it be so, it is not England only that will be the gainer; the 'vasti luminis orae' will receive increase.

ALFRED FAWKES.

III. *The Policy of Reconstruction.*

1. To cast down the statues of the Gods is not always an act of unbelief—it is usually the proclamation of a higher conception of divinity. PAUL SABATIER.

2. The ultimate goal is the unification of thought, the fusion of all secular and all religious thinking, in one comprehensive and harmonious system. If I am not mistaken, such a unification is nearer than it has been for a very long time.
DR. SANDAY.

3. The foundations of 'religious knowledge' have often been shaken because they have been laid on the shifting sands of obsolete philosophy, unauthenticated tradition, and incompetent authority. CANON W. DANKS.

4. The fetish of primitiveness is scarcely less to be deprecated than the fetish of mediaevalism. DR. H. B. SWETE.

5. At every turn we are constrained to feel that we can learn to good effect from the Apostolic Age only by studying its principles and ideals, not by copying its precedents.
DR. F. J. A. HORT.

6. Our theology has been cast in a scholastic mode, *i.e.* all based on logic. We are in need of, and we are being gradually forced into, a theology based on psychology. The transition, I fear, will not be without much pain; but nothing can prevent it. ARCHBISHOP TEMPLE (1857).

7. The removal of Christianity from the historic to the psychological realm is the great need of our time. AMIEL.

8. Every acquisition of knowledge compels us to conceive of God as immanent in the world and in man. Physical Science forces us to a fresh analysis of the religious idea of *creation*, which will provide for God's immediate activity in the world of nature. History is forcing us to a fresh analysis of the idea of *revelation*, which will provide for God's immediate activity in the total spiritual development of human society. Psychology is forcing us to a fresh analysis of *redemption*, which will provide for God's moral action in the development of the individual soul. Out of this three-fold analysis will issue a new and fruitful realization of God as operant in the world and in man. ANON.

9. Re-statement of the Church's belief acquired by the progressive revelation of the Holy Spirit and in accordance with

the needs of the age, would take place along three main lines: (1) In the acceptance of an immanent divine power ever working in the physical and human spheres, and working in an orderly fashion. (2) In the recognition of the divine and human character of Christianity—divine, in the sense that it draws its origin from the supernatural or spiritual world; human, because it has been embodied in human society and has had to grow amid human conditions. (3) In the realization that religious truth is attained, not merely by speculative thought, but by its combination with the practical experience of the Christian life. This will mean that in the future Christian truth will be presented historically and psychologically, and not in the scholastic forms which have hitherto been customary and authoritative. PROF. P. GARDNER.

10. Whoever, in our age of numbers and religious competition, seeks to minister to the questioning few who can be won to listen from the borderlands of faith; whoever is prepared, if it must be so, to be criticized and misunderstood by every sincere obscurantist of his time; whoever, knowing the risks of the way, and not forgetting how easily the claim for liberty of teaching may become the hard, contentious, illiberal assertion of individual whims, still takes his stand by conviction on the side of wider interpretation, of greater generosity towards those without, of larger spiritual freedom, and of sympathy for uncertain souls, may be encouraged by recollecting with what tact, with what kindly care for narrower susceptibilities, yet also with what clear intention and with what great courage, the cause of the thoughtful minority was once maintained in an Alexandrian lecture-room, about which in certain circles there were doubtless great searchings of heart.

CANON R. B. TOLLINTON.

11. Mazzini thus contrasts the theology of the Vatican with that of his own: (1) Your definition of life is the doctrine of original sin; ours asserts the imperfection of the finite creature, and its gradual self-correction through faith in a divine ideal which each is bound to incarnate in himself. (2) You believe in *miracles;* in the supernatural; in the possible violation of the laws regulating the universe; we believe in the unknown.

the mysterious (to be one day solved), which now encompasses us on every side. (3) You believe in a God who has created and reposes; we believe in a continuity of creation. (4) You believe in a heaven extrinsic to the universe; we believe in *one Heaven*, in which we live and move and love; which embraces (as an ocean the islands that stud its surface) the whole indefinite series of existences through which we pass. (5) You believe in the resurrection of the body, such as it was at the termination of our earthly existence; we believe in the *transformation* of the body (which is naught else but an instrument adapted to the work to be achieved) in conformity with the progress of the *Ego*, or with the mission destined to succeed to the present. (6) All things are, in your creed, definite, limited, immediate, bearing the stamp of a certain immobility, which recalls the characteristics of the materialist conception of life. In our creed all is life, movement, succession and continuity. (7) Your dogma humanizes God; our dogma teaches the slow, progressive *divinisation* of man. MAZZINI.

12. We shall always have the unthinking, unknowing multitude to reckon with, but let us not extinguish the prophet out of respect for the fools. GEORGE TYRRELL.

13. Doubt has real value in life; it clears away rubbish and stimulates search for truth; but it has no value unless it is finally swallowed up in positive assurance . . . Goethe is right when he makes Mephistopheles, his devil, say: 'I am the spirit of negation, for negation, save as it paves the way for positive conviction, always bedevils life.

DR. H. E. FOSDICK.

14. There is need of a new Thomas à Kempis, going as deeply into the foundation of life, and yet not revolting the commonsense of the twentieth century, combining in a manual of piety, religious fervour with perfect good sense and knowledge of the world. B. JOWETT.

15. You must not forsake the shippe in a tempest because you cannot keep down the windes. SIR THOMAS MORE.

SOME CRITICISMS OF THE CAMBRIDGE CONFERENCE

By the Rev. C. W. Emmet, B.D., Fellow of University College, Oxford.

THE stream of criticism on the Cambridge Conference runs unchecked, and, without making any attempt to deal in detail with the articles, speeches and sermons which swell its current, it may be useful to attempt to form some estimate of its general direction and force.

1. A healthy interest has been stirred in the fundamental problem of Christology. Men are asking everywhere with quite a new curiosity what is really meant by speaking of Christ as God and Man, what is His true relation to God on the one hand, and to His fellow-men on the other. As Mr. Mozley acknowledges, 'It has certainly led to a revivifying sense of the central importance, not only of the person of Christ, but of true thought concerning him.'[1] The ordinary student of theology, who has often worn an air of polite boredom when he comes to the division of his subject known as 'Doctrine,' has realized that it deals with something that matters, and is eager to be in a position to give his own answer to the questions which have been raised. Traditionalists and Modernists alike can count this as sheer gain.

2. It is generally acknowledged, *e.g.* by Bishop Gore, that the Modernist is justified to the hilt in his insistence on the reality of Christ's manhood. And this includes not merely physical feeling, or certain emotions, but a true mental and spiritual development. His temptations and struggles were real; His prayers not a mere piece of acting; He had a human soul and lived as a man. This admission must be given its full weight. It means that, whatever the formal safeguards of the humanity in the Chalcedonian formula and so forth, the general conception of Christ has been such that the humanity

[1] *Christ and the Nicene Creed*: Two Sermons preached in Leeds Parish Church. By J. K. Mozley, B.D.

has not been taken seriously. The necessity that it should be so taken is a factor in the problem, and must involve some redressing of the balance. When the Modernist protests against Docetism and Apollinarianism he is not tilting at windmills.

Closely connected with this is the question how far Christ consciously thought of Himself as God. Here critical and theological considerations converge. We find in all sources of the Gospels a consciousness of a mission and of a unique relationship to God, but the earlier the source the less do we find that Jesus definitely indentified Himself with God in the later Trinitarian sense. Considerations derived from our experience of the conditions of human life, in ourselves and in our fellow-men, point to the same conclusion. Could a being who knows Himself to be God, the Creator and upholder of the Universe, have a consciousness which was truly human? It is very important to notice that Canon Quick, in a very sympathetic, though critical, discussion of Dr. Rashdall's views in the *Commonwealth* for November, admits this: 'I feel constrained to agree both that there is a sense in which our Lord in the days of His flesh did not identify Himself with God, and that to deny this is, in the light of modern knowledge, to deny the reality of the Incarnation altogether . . . The full God-Head would have been present in the manhood yet not fully present to the consciousness of the man.'

It is at this point that the evidence of the Fourth Gospel would make most difference if it could be admitted as a first-hand historical document. In many of the criticisms it has been loosely implied that the acceptance of the Fourth Gospel as Johannine and historical would upset the whole Modernist position, and the suggestion is not infrequently made that its rejection is ultimately due to a desire to explain away the God-Head of Christ. Neither suggestion is justified. The primary reason why many modern scholars find it impossible to regard the Gospel as a record of actual events, is because of its inconsistency with the Synoptists, not because it is more supernatural. And if it were accepted without reserve, it would not seriously affect the leading ideas of Modernist Christology, which, indeed, go back, in some measure, to this very Gospel:

the relation of the Logos in Christ to the Logos in other men, the essential kinship between God and man, and the strenuous objection to Tritheism. And on the very question of the consciousness of Christ, we have to remember that even the risen Jesus speaks of 'My God and your God.' The main result of its acceptance would be to make it impossible to trace any real development in our Lord's consciousness of Himself, and in the disciples' apprehension of the secret of His Person. The Modernist accepts the Fourth Gospel as a true record of the stage reached by Christian experience in 100 A.D. He only denies that it represents the point of view of 30 A.D., and taking it as an interpretation, he regards it as in principle a true and valid interpretation which he can accept himself so long as it is balanced by constant reference to the Synoptists.[2]

3. Another point where Modernists have met with much sympathy is in the refusal to see any meaning in the statement that Christ was man but not a man. It turns, of course, on the possibility of separating human nature from human personality. Canon Peter Green has made strenuous efforts to explain and justify the difference, but Canon Quick again agrees 'that in this matter Dr. Rashdall's criticism of the Bishop (of Zanzibar) is justified, and that in affirming the human ego he has essential orthodoxy on his side.'

Philosophically this is the difficulty: we are to suppose two natures, two wills, and yet only one person. One of the writer's keenest recollections of his first introduction to dogmatic theology, at a time when he was untouched by the lightest breath of Modernism, is his bewilderment in reading the account of the Monothelite controversy with the decision that Christ had two wills. Must not this imply a double personality? This was a question he asked then, and he has never

[2] Mr. Christopher Cheshire, in an address, 'Modernism and Orthodoxy,' makes great play with the attitude of Modernists to the Fourth Gospel. 'The orthodox must not illustrate the claim to divinity from St. John; but the modernist may always oppose the Virgin Birth by adducing the (so-called) silence of St. John on that point. It is, in fact, the old business of the cake!' It is surely obvious that the Fourth Gospel is good evidence of how far the Virgin Birth was known or emphasized at the end of the first century, and that the validity of this evidence is entirely independent of whether it is a historical record of things that happened or were said in 30 A.D.

found a satisfying answer. No doubt, given the elements in the problem as it presented itself to the ages of the Councils, the decision of the Catholic Church was right here, as it was right all through, assuming as a starting point the theory of two separate substances. But it is a decision which, in the Bishop of Manchester's phrase, marks 'the bankruptcy of the Chalcedonian theology,' and which suggests that we must start afresh from a better conception of personality, a conception which will enable us to think of Christ as human and divine, and yet a single personality with a single will.

4. We pass here to the centre of the problem as it has been rightly and quite inevitably stressed by most of the critics of the Conference, the question of pre-existence. As Dr. Mackintosh[3] shows so well, this is not simply a question of metaphysics, but of the fundamental religious appeal of Christianity. 'Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven'; 'Who for our sakes became poor'; 'He emptied Himself and took upon Him the form of a servant.' The sense that God did something Himself when the Word became flesh, that He sacrificed Himself in a way which cost Him something—this, we are told truly, is the dynamic of Christianity; and this we are told, less truly I would venture to maintain, is lost in the Modernist presentation.[4] Here at least is a really important criticism which we must meet frankly.

I would suggest that the real difficulty of preserving this dynamic is not peculiar to Modernism, but is common to all scientific theology, since it is a point where the demands of religion and philosophy are not lightly to be reconciled. 'Who for us men came down . . .' The picture behind such words is of a separate person, the Son, who leaves a state of joy and supreme power and enters on a state of suffering and weakness for a definite period, after which He returns once more to the empty place which is waiting for Him in heaven. It is a picture of two Beings, of two Gods, one of whom, at least, is thought of as a person exactly in the human sense, though no doubt with indefinitely heightened attributes. Of course, the

[3] *The Person of Jesus Christ*, pp. 458 *ff.*
[4] See, *e.g.*, Mozley *op. cit.* pp. 14 *ff.*

trained theologian qualifies this picture at once. He says as strongly as Dr. Rashdall that it was the Logos which pre-existed, not the human soul of Jesus, that He was not a separate person from the Father,[5] that even during the period of the Incarnation He was still in heaven ('the heavenly Word proceeding forth, yet leaving not the Father's side'). Still, as Logos He performs His cosmic functions; during the period of the ministry He was still in other men as He had been in Socrates and Plato.[6]

So run the qualifications, but the trouble is that the dynamic appeal seems to lie precisely in the ditheistic features and to be largely weakened by the explanations of the theologian. The theologian will say that heaven is a state, and the other a spatial metaphor; Heaven is where God is and Christ was never separate from God. But then what becomes of this very idea of 'coming down from Heaven,' which we are told is of supreme importance? Indeed, as I understand it, the view of a Liberal such as Dr. Rashdall does not in the last resort differ very widely from that of orthodox theology except that it insists that these qualifications must be taken quite seriously and that ditheism, no less than Docetism, is ultimately fatal to a true Incarnation.

The Logos in Christ pre-existed *as a person in whatever sense we rightly understand personality as predicated of the three Persons of the Trinity*. There may be and there is room for difference of opinion on this ultimate question of the nature of God, but by common consent Father, Son and Spirit are not three separate centres of consciousness like three members of a committee, and the difficulty is that the Evangelistic presentation of the Incarnation would appear to demand that they should be *pictured* as such. It is a problem for orthodoxy, which has really been content to say one thing in its popular preaching and to safeguard the theological truth only in asides to which the ordinary listener pays little attention, or in its technical

[5] We 'must see the pre-incarnate One *in* God, not alongside of God' (Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, p. 454).

[6] Mackintosh (*op. cit.*, pp. 483 *ff*) refuses to consider this problem of the continuance of the cosmic functions of the Logos during the Incarnation, but it arises inevitably and cannot be ignored.

theology which he never reads. The Modernist controversy has forced the issue to the surface and we have got to choose. The Church must either admit that her Trinitarian theology is wrong and that her philosophy must make room for two (or three) separate Beings, or she must find some way of presenting the philosophy in her popular preaching, so that it becomes an integral and normal part of the evangelistic appeal of Christianity. Orthodoxy is bound to face this difficulty no less than Modernism.

It is a common complaint that men are not moved by this appeal as they were. Among the reasons we may count this, that they feel instinctively that the conception of the two Heavenly Beings, which they suppose to lie behind it, cannot really hold good. Pathetic requests are made every year for a better observance of Ascension Day. The reason for its neglect is not merely that it falls on a week-day, which is not a public holiday, but that the popular teaching, *e.g.* of the Ascension Day hymns, suggests the picture of a Conqueror returning from an expedition abroad to a throne which he has temporarily vacated, and this sort of ditheism has ceased to be tenable. Religion is bound to lose its dynamic unless there is a reasonable philosophy behind it.

It may not unreasonably be suggested that the way to reconciliation is to be found in the kind of view towards which Modernism is tentatively feeling its way. It protests, and protests seriously, against any form of Docetism, Apollinarianism and Tritheism, and urges that the protest cannot be confined to technical theology, but must also be reflected in the way in which Christianity is actually taught. It suggests that this may be secured by emphasizing the quite orthodox view that the Incarnation is not an isolated event but is of a piece with the whole divine working in relation to man. To quote Dr. Mackintosh, 'We see God, as it were, ever on His way to incarnation, moving on by new accesses of self-communication, approaching always nearer to complete personal union, in creation and prophecy and redemption. It is in this direction that our minds are led by the great Johannine conception of the Logos or Eternal Son; for the Logos, now manifest in

Jesus, is but a name for the one God as He ever goes forth to the world in self-revealing act."[7]

'In Christ the personal redeeming distinction or aspect in God through which He goes forth into the world, to save by truth and grace, takes historical form in the conditions of finite life . . . Jesus is "the Incarnation, the Fulfilment, the expression in conditions of time and space, of that Intending Will which is coming to itself in the Universe of human souls." There is no longer any question of a quiescent Divine substance planted in bare mechanical juxtaposition with impersonal manhood; in Jesus' soul, rather, is given the spiritual life-content of God, the outgoing of His infinite redeeming Self into the experience of a growing finite spirit."[8]

On this view the Incarnation is the classical and supreme example, the focussing in a point of history, of what God is always doing in proportion as man responds and co-operates. The whole creative process by which man is raised from the beast till he becomes a Son of God is 'the gradual reproduction in time of a Divine Sonship, a filial life, grounded in and modelled on the eternal Sonship characteristic of the inner life of God' . . . It 'represents the intra-mundane self-fulfilment of a personal originative principle interior to the being of God Himself."[9] And this self-fulfilment of God, in its age-long conflict against the downward pull of sin, means a redemptive process which somehow carries with it suffering and a self-emptying of the Divine. In His people's sufferings He is always afflicted; both the Incarnation and the death upon the Cross are the manifestation of a loving self-giving which is involved in the whole relation of the creative and redeeming God to His children. Always the Word is coming down from heaven, always for our sakes becoming poor and taking upon Him the form of a servant.

The point to be noted is that this emphasis on continuity, which is entirely in keeping with the evolutionary principle, does not exclude the view that in the Incarnation there yet

[7] *Op. cit.*, pp. 434 *f.*

[8] *Ib.*, pp. 500 *f.* Dr. Mackintosh's quotation is from Hutton, *Authority and Person of our Lord*, p. 9.

[9] Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, p. 435, n. 1.

emerges something new. '*Continuity of process and the emergence of real differences*—these are . . . the twin aspects of the cosmic history, and it is essential to clear thinking that the one be not allowed to obscure the other.'[10] On these lines we may best approach the old dilemma of a difference in degree and a difference in kind, as between the Logos in Christ and the Logos in other men, or between Jesus and His fellows, which has figured so largely in criticisms of the Conference. In the evolutionary process you always get continuity; you cannot put your finger on any one point and say here is a break, here a gap where God clearly comes in; but on the other hand you do get the emergence of real qualitative differences, the ascent to a new stage. The spectrum offers a rough analogy. Each colour blends imperceptibly into the next; you cannot say at any point 'here green passes into blue.' But look at two points far removed on the scale and you have a real difference; red is not yellow. The question of a difference of degree or kind becomes largely a question of the point of view and the context; are you thinking of the process or of the result?

These are, of course, only tentative suggestions, and I must not make the readers of the doctrinal papers at Cambridge responsible for them, though they are not, I think, alien to their general line of thought. I should wish to close as I began by emphasizing the fact which emerges clearly from the Conference and the criticisms which have been passed on it, that the last word has not yet been said on the problem of Christology. In particular there *seems* for orthodox and Liberal alike to be a divorce between the values of religion and the demands of philosophy, and this is a situation which no one who believes in the unity of all truth can be content to accept as final.

I should wish at this point, again on my own responsibility, to endorse very heartily a suggestion made by a friend, who would probably be regarded as a staunch Anglo-Catholic. It is that we have reached a stage where what we really need is a frank conference on the whole subject between men of dif-

[10] Pringle-Pattison, *The Idea of God*, p. 103.

ferent schools of thought. The condition would of course be that we should refrain not only from calling one another names, but from thinking them. All would meet on the basis of the frank recognition that the question is not closed and that each side has something to contribute. It may be that at first, at any rate, the best method might be to proceed by way of small informal discussions between groups of friends in different localities who would come together easily and naturally. Something bigger and more central might or might not ultimately emerge. But at any rate those who take different views would come to understand one another, and those who believe in the power of a fellowship of thought and prayer must look not merely for an increase in mutual respect, but also for some deeper apprehension of the truth which alone can save the world.

The Dean of Durham closes a criticism of the Conference[11] with the charge that Modern Churchmen 'have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid Him.' He seems to have forgotten that when the words were first uttered the charge was false, and that the living Christ was standing by the speaker all the time. There is always the danger that the Church, with the love and reverence indeed of the Magdalene, but also with her short-sighted blindness, may insist on seeking for the Christ in the tomb where she has swathed Him in her formulae and definitions. He is not there; He has burst His bonds and is risen. It is for the believer in all ages to open his eyes and to see Him by his side alive; and having seen Him to carry the word to those whom He is not ashamed to call His brethren.

[11] *The Contemporary Review*, Nov., 1921.

THE NEW JERUSALEM AND THE ROSE ETERNAL

By M. G. Glazebrook, D.D., Canon Residentiary of Ely.

THE last three chapters of the book of Revelation have exercized an immense influence upon the religious imagination. The breadth of their movement, the vividness of their imagery, the intensity of the feeling which they exhibit, give them a wonderful charm. And yea, to the reader who reflects, the charm is hardly greater than the puzzle which they present. From xx, 1, to xxi, 8, the narrative is plain. Defeated in the battle of Armageddon, Satan is imprisoned for a thousand years, during which the living saints and those who have a part in the first resurrection reign with Christ on earth. Then Satan, released from prison, leads the nations of earth to assault 'the beloved city' and the camp of the saints. His army is destroyed by fire from heaven, and he is imprisoned for ever in the Lake of Fire. Then follows a general resurrection of the dead, and the judgment of all mankind: after which heaven and earth pass away. Finally a new heaven and a new earth are created: and in the centre of the new earth is established the 'New Jerusalem,' wherein God sets up his throne and dwells among the blessed for ever. The wicked, condemned in the judgment, are assigned to 'the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death' (xxi, 8).

But then, all of a sudden (xxi, 9) we are invited to gaze at a 'heavenly Jerusalem,' which stands on the old earth, and is surrounded by the nations of the world, many of whom are evil-doers, but who are evidently still living, and are evidently destined to form Satan's final army. Obviously there is some confusion here. Many scholars have felt the difficulty and tried to explain it away. Dr. Charles has been the first to face it, and to supply what appears to be the true explanation. He supposes, with much plausibility, that the author, whose hand alone could complete and arrange the fragments which it had already written, was overtaken by death, perhaps the death of a martyr: and the disciple into whose care the unfinished

manuscript passed, failing to understand the relation of the various fragments, arranged them in a mistaken order. Dr. Charles has made a brave attempt to discover the true order. Few will agree with him in every detail: but he seems to me to have proved his principal contention, which may be described in a few words.

The main narrative consisted of xx, 1—xxi, 5*a*, xxii, 3-5, and xxi, 5*b*-8, but xxii, 3-5, written as a supplement on a separate sheet, was not recognized by the editor. That narrative contains a reference to 'the beloved city' where the saints 'reign,' but no description of it. That seems strange, for we should expect at least a brief account. Where is it to be found? The answer is as follows:—Readers will remember that (in chapter xvi) when the seventh vial is poured out, the world-wide catastrophe is related in four conventional verses. The reason was a desire to maintain a proportion between the accounts of the seven seals. But the reader's disappointment is healed in a sort of postscript. The seventeenth and eighteenth chapter gives a most moving and dramatic account of the fall of Babylon. A similar postscript is to be found in the twenty-first chapter. After the sixth verse of chapter xx, it would have been natural to describe the bride of the Lamb, the heavenly Jerusalem in which Christ and the saints were to reign for a thousand years. But the writer's mind was so full that he could not compress his thought into the few lines which alone would be allowed by the scale of his main narrative. Perhaps also he hesitated whether to describe the bride there or earlier. Since she was the prize for which the battle of Armageddon was fought (xix, 9), her picture might well have been placed after chapter nineteen. At any rate he wrote the description of the bride, the heavenly Jerusalem, which we know so well (xxi, 9-27, xxii, 1, 2, 14, 15, 17), at such length that it must stand apart. And he marked it carefully as a postscript, by using exactly the same words of introduction as in xvii, 1: 'And there came one of the seven angels, who had the seven vials . . . and spake unto me, saying, "Come hither, and I will show thee."' But the mention of 'New Jerusalem' in the second verse of the same chapter confused the mind of the editor, as it has those of countless readers: and the two Jeru-

salems, quite distinct in the mind of the author, have been identified.

The long description of the 'heavenly Jerusalem' may be summed up in a few words. Planted on the site of the historic Jerusalem, which John had destroyed, is a new city of supernatural size and splendour. Only the saints dwell in it, and nothing unclean may enter. It is the centre of spiritual illumination for the world: 'the nations shall walk in the light thereof.' But not all are converted and 'wash their robes,' so that they may have the right to enter. There remains a vast heathen world without, who will form Satan's new army when he is released at the end of a thousand years.

The contrast between this picture and the somewhat bare outline of the 'New Jerusalem' is plain enough, though it has generally escaped observation. In the latter there are no measurements to indicate an impressive magnitude, no gorgeous gates of pearl or streets of gold, nor foundations built of precious stones. The reason is obvious. The old earth, of which these materials were the treasures and the ornaments, has passed away: and for that which takes its place the seer has no language which is adequate. Probably, if he were asked, he would say that the New Jerusalem is part of a spiritual world, and therefore not to be measured with material scales or described in terms of material substances. Like the resurrection bodies of the saints—their 'garments of light and glory'—the world which is their eternal home defies description in human speech. For his contemporary the author of the second book of Baruch has written in a similar vein:

> They shall behold the world which is now invisible to them,
> And they shall behold the time which is now hidden from them:
> For in the heights of that world they shall dwell,
> And they shall be made equal to the angels,
> And be made equal to the stars,
> And they shall be changed into every form they desire,
> From beauty into loveliness,
> And from light into the splendour of glory—
> (*2 Baruch*, 51, 8-10; Charles' translation).

What is the religious value of these predictions? That must depend in part upon the interpretation which is given to the book as a whole: and interpretations have been numerous and diverse. Most of them identify the series of events fore-

told in the Apocalypse with the more striking events in the history of the world between the first century and the lifetime of the writer, and find the Beast in the most prominent tyrant of the writer's age, be he Frederick I or some Pope or Napoleon or the Kaiser Wilhelm. That method has been finally discredited by the avalanche of nonsense which the great war produced. It is, moreover, inconsistent with the evident belief of the author that all these events were to happen very soon. Not here and there, but all through, the Seer's visions quite definitely picture the events as not more than a few years distant. The whole line of prophecies leads up directly to the thrice repeated saying: 'Behold, I come quickly.'

We may therefore rule out what is called the 'futurist' interpretation, which assumes that the author had in view a series of events which lie still in the future; and consider the claim of others that the heavenly Jerusalem did come very quickly in the form of the Catholic Church. Dr. Milligan writes: 'There are distinct indications in the apocalyptic vision which leave no interpretation possible save one—that the new Jerusalem has come, that it has been in the midst of us for more than eighteen hundred years, that it is now in the midst of us, and that it shall continue to be so wherever its King has those who love and serve Him.' Surely he must be a hardened optimist who can read the history of the Churches, or look round upon their present condition, and yet find a fair description of them, or of any one of them, in such words as: 'And the city hath no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine upon it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the lamp thereof is the Lamb . . . And there shall in no wise enter into it anything unclean, or he that maketh an abomination and a lie.' I confess that such interpretations appear to me to assume that language means nothing, and therefore may be taken to mean anything we please.

If none of these views can be maintained, what is left? If, as seems certain, the predictions of the Seer referred to the immediate future, and were not in any literal sense fulfilled, does that failure deprive them of religious value? What can be the worth for us of visions, however vivid, and descriptions, however picturesque, which do not correspond to any past

events in human history, and which cannot refer to events now future, because the time indicated has long gone by? That depends, surely, upon the nature of the visions; whether they are mere predictions or whether they represent an ideal which has independent worth. Let me quote a familiar example.

Three of the most famous chapters in Isaiah—written, I believe, near the close of the great prophet's life—are what is called Messianic. All alike—the 9th, the 11th and the 32nd—foretell the coming of a descendant of David who shall be king in Jerusalem, and a king so just, so wise, so powerful, that the whole people shall be regenerated. If we interpret the ninth chapter in its natural sense, it was written shortly after the retreat of Sennacherib from Judah, and the child whose birth it celebrates was a son of Hezekiah. It was that child of whom the aged prophet wrote:

> 'The government shall rest upon his shoulder;
> And his name shall be called Wonderful Counsellor,
> Godlike hero, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.
> His dominion shall increase, and of peace there shall be no end.'

Neither this prediction, nor the similar ones in the 11th and 32nd chapters, were fulfilled. After a hundred years of decadence, the Hebrew monarchy came to an end, and it never has been and never can be revived in such a form as the prophet imagined, unless the Christian religion should perish.

Are those three famous chapters, then, of no value? He would be a bold man who should say so. For they wrought a revolution in the thought of mankind. They taught Israel, and through Israel all the world, to see the Israel in the future, not (as before) in the past. To look forward instead of backward: to let hope take the place of regret: to adopt progress for a watchword instead of conservation: was not this to change the face of the moral world? Isaiah's prophecy has inspired generation after generation for 2,600 years, not because it met with any liberal fulfilment, but because, in language which can never lose its power, it proclaimed an ideal, which men have more and more recognized as that which ought to be, that towards which the whole creation moves.

Surely we may say the same about the twin pictures of the heavenly and the new Jerusalem. Allowing for the difference between the language of prophecy and that of apocalypse, can

we deny that St. John's visions are essentially a development—larger, grander, and more spiritual—of Isaiah's? The millenium—the reign of Christ on earth with the heavenly Jerusalem for His capital—presents the prophet's picture of the Kingdom of God in a glorified form, enriched by the resurrection of the martyrs and transfigured by the personal presence of its Divine King. Let us compare two short passages, and ask ourselves whether they do not closely correspond.

Isaiah writes:

> 'His dominion shall increase, and of peace there shall be no end,
> Upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom,
> To establish it and to uphold it with justice and righteousness,
> From henceforth and for ever.

And St. John writes:

> 'The glory of the Lord doth lighten the city,
> And the lamp thereof is the Lamb.
> And the nations shall walk by the light thereof:
> And the Kings of the earth do bring their glory into it.
> And the gates thereof shall not be shut day or night:
> And they shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations into it.'

Both these prophets, amid many differences, express the same pair of essential thoughts. The ideal for the world is the union of mankind in peace and brotherhood, inspired by common worship and common obedience. And what ought to be, must be; nay, sooner or later shall be. They looked for it to come very soon, whether in the normal course of history or through some miraculous intervention of divine power. We, taught by the experience of long waiting, have given up trying to fix dates. But we have not given up the visions. Taught alike by the prophets and by the long struggles of mankind, we are increasingly sure that the Kingdom of God is the only satisfying ideal for human society: that nothing less can be the consummation of the marvellous process by which man has been led upward from the humblest origin, and is still being led. Never was there a time when men so longed for such a consummation! The whole world is astir with aspiration. The socialist, the communist, the anarchist, as well as the Christian supporter of the League of Nations, are trying to find the way to a heavenly Jerusalem, in which (as Isaiah says):

> 'The work of righteousness shall be peace,
> And the effect of justice shall be security.'

Isaiah believed that God's normal providence would lead mankind to this blessed end. The writers of the apocalypses, despairing of what seemed a long and tortuous road, looked for a short cut by means of miracle. There are men in our time who, because they have no faith in God, seek to hew a short cut for themselves with axe and sword, or to blast it with bombs and dynamite. No doubt a large part of mankind are content with their present condition, or rather acquiesce in it as inevitable. But they are the lower races. All the progressive races, all those upon whom the future depends, widely as their ideals differ, and the means by which they propose to attain them, are as one in looking for a new and better state of human society on earth, which shall secure peace among nations and brotherhood among men. That universal aspiration has never found, and perhaps never will find, a more adequate symbol than the picture of the heavenly Jerusalem.

But the Seer did not expect the heavenly Jerusalem, the Kingdom of God on earth, to be permanent. He describes the gradual gathering of the forces of evil outside its range, which are at last to make an assault under Satan's leadership. In other words, like most of the later Jewish writers of apocalypse, he felt that perfection was not to be attained on earth by men who lived under anything like earthly conditions. Like them he regarded the Kingdom of God as a step—necessary but transient—to such a spiritual kingdom as could alone be conceived to endure for ever. In spite of all their imaginative efforts, they could not picture a perfect society in which birth and death, marrying and giving in marriage, eating and drinking, found regular place. So they fixed a term of years, beyond which the Kingdom of God on earth could not endure; and looked for the ideal in a new world, after the old world had dissolved. Our Lord was in a measure endorsing their forecast when He said that in the Resurrection there would be neither marrying nor giving in marriage, but men would be as the angels of God.

That is the secret of the new Jerusalem, which is so like, and yet so unlike, the heavenly Jerusalem. The latter answers to the earthly hopes of the better part of mankind: the former shows the fulfilment of hopes which cannot be satisfied on

earth. As I have pointed out, the description is vague. It has none of the gorgeous detail which adorns the capital of the millenial kingdom. How could it be otherwise? For eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. So what could we desire more than:

> 'The presence of God is with men,
> And he shall dwell with them,
> And they shall be his people,
> And he shall be their God.
> And God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes,
> And death shall be no more:
> Neither shall there be mourning, nor crying, nor pain, any more:
> Neither shall there be any more curse.'

Do not these words express essential elements of eternal life, so far as we are able to conceive it? What does it matter, though St. John imagined their fulfilment to be very near at hand? His vision of the new Jerusalem remains an inspiring symbol of that which surpasses the descriptive power of painter or poet.

And yet, as we reflect upon his description, we find something lacking. We cannot surely believe that to be a perfect state of existence, in which there is no sphere for the mind's activity, nor any provision for the social relations upon which a large part of our happiness depends. That lack seems to have been observed by another and (I venture to say) a greater Seer, who died six hundred years ago. At any rate, the lack is supplied by the vision which Dante records as having been granted him at Eastertide in the year 1300. Let me briefly recall part of what he tells us in the Paradiso. After exploring the dreadful depths of hell, he climbed the mount of Purgatory on whose summit lay the earthly Paradise. Thence, led by Beatrice, he passed upward through the crystal spheres which encompass the earth, and in each conversed with saints who were enjoying the various degrees of bliss which are assigned to the spheres' inhabitants. Yet even the heavenly spheres proved not to be the real home of the blessed. That was found when, passing still upward, he reached the mystic 'Rose Eternal.' The poet bids us imagine a white rose, full blown and almost infinite in size, whose petals, ranged in countless

circles round the centre, rise tier above tier further than the eye can reach. Each petal is the seat of a soul in bliss. Patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, matrons and virgins, kings and bishops, and even blessed infants, are all ranged in their appropriate places. Whether they be near or far from each other or from the centre, matters nothing to them; for in that heavenly sphere distance does not separate, and each soul can converse with every other, of all ages and nations. So they live in a perfect state of social union, each in harmony with all. But even that is not the best feature of their state. In the centre of the mystic rose is a vast lake, a circle of glassy water, whose surface reflects all the petals in glorious light. That light comes down from above, from the Triune Deity whose rays, too dazzling even for the eyes of the redeemed, are tempered to a mellow splendour as they are seen mirrored in the depths of the lake. Not only for the eye is that glorious light. It is the sign and vehicle of a spiritual illumination, which penetrates every soul, and lends to every mind all the radiance which it is able to receive.

So Dante's vision answers to the cravings which we cannot but feel for the joys of converse and the exercise of intellect. It is a symbol, and a symbol cannot wholly satisfy: but it can inspire. And surely the contemplation of the poet's picture, drawn in words of fire, fills us with thoughts too rich for words, and with feelings too deep for tears.

Has Dante said the last word, or does our own experience, and that of mankind in six hundred years, suggest a demand for anything which neither of the great Seers has offered? I think there are yet three aspirations of which our generation are conscious.

One is the hope that the love and friendship which are the salt of this life may be consummated in a perfect communion of soul with soul, where there are no barriers of flesh to divide or to obscure. The Hebrew Seer naturally thought more of the happiness of tribes than of individuals: the great Italian tells us, by the mouth of Cato, that human affections lose their force, and become a colourless memory. But our hearts assure us that 'There shall never be one lost good,' and that love is the greatest good of all.

A second demand is for active service. To John and to Dante alike the universe appeared a comparatively little thing, comprising only the earth and the crystal sphere in which sun and stars revolved around it. When human life on our planet was ended, and all souls assigned to their eternal abodes, there would be nothing to do: but duty and joy would be summed up in the beatific vision. We who know the earth to be but a tiny speck in a universe whose bounds no calculation and no fancy can reach, see in its magnitude and variety the objects of ever new knowledge, the sphere of new service, which might fill eternity. So when we try to conceive the fulness of an ideal existence, we cannot but include therein the hope of ceaseless activity and growth and service.

The third demand is not a mere supplement to the Seer's forecast, but a challenge to a part of it. After promising the blessedness of the new Jerusalem to all whose names are written in the book of life, John proceeds to say of the fearful and unbelieving and other sinners that 'their part shall be in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death.' A death, that is, which is a life of endless and hopeless torment. Dante draws no such contrast. Once uplifted to the highest heaven, his thought does not return to that which it has left behind. But we who read his poem cannot forget that all the horrors which glow in the pages of the Inferno with so lurid a flame, are in his conception destined to endure for ever. So in the vision of both Seers the hope of bliss for the few is linked with the doom of endless misery for the many. Such indeed was the teaching of the Christian Church as a whole until the last century was well advanced. But we have not so learned Christ. Nay, we should be speaking in the spirit of His teaching if we dared to say: Better no resurrection at all than that the thousands should rise to bliss but the millions to unending torment. God, we believe, is love. And if love is divine, must it not be in the end victorious? And where would be love's victory if countless souls were to remain rebels for ever, hating and hateful, suffering pains which could but aggravate their enmity? Only if love's victory be assured can we give a full assent to St. Paul's affirmation that God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself.

IN MEMORIAM

EUGÈNE MÉNÉGOZ

Professor Eugène Ménégoz died on October 29th, after a long illness, at the age of eighty-three. Some of the readers of the *Modern Churchman* will have known him personally, others will from time to time have read translations of brief articles by him in its pages.[1]

The following notes, taken from an 'In Memoriam' in *Evangile et Liberté* of November 9th, will be of interest to our readers :—

Eugène Ménégoz was appointed Professor of the Faculty of Protestant Theology, when that Faculty was founded at Paris. He brought with him the robustness and vigour of Alsatian culture, and his teaching was distinguished by soundness, conscientiousness, and lucidity. Professor Ménégoz was also Director of the Seminary, or hostel of the Faculty, a post in which he earned the life-long gratitude and devotion of the students who, as French Protestants, brought up in the atmosphere and for the championship of freedom, required judicious and sympathetic rule and guidance, and Professor Ménégoz knew how to blend with paternal indulgence such exercise of authority as the occasion might demand; he also permanently inspired some of the students with his own love of work.

In 1882 Ménégoz published his '*Le péché et la rédemption d'après Saint Paul,*' and in 1898 '*La théologie de l'épître aux Hébreux.*'[2]

The teaching of Eugène Ménégoz admirably supplemented that of his friend and colleague, Auguste Sabatier. Sabatier strove to 'save the faith' of the students by means of his 'symbolism.' He said that religion as conceived in the minds of men was forced to express itself in images, in symbols, which symbols vary with the mentality of a country or an age; and this represents the variable factor of dogma.

Ménégoz developed the Lutheran conception of salvation by faith, *solâ fide,* but faith with him was essentially a state of heart, of feeling, and of trust. Faith was the consecration of the whole individual to God, and such faith is independent of any special beliefs held by the individual or the age. Soon these two teachings became identified as *symbolo-fidéisme.* Thus originated the School of Paris, which stood for making faith independent of the results of criticism and history. If, said Ménégoz, such results lead to new views regarding such and such a question, we accept the views which are the result of our enquiry, but without fear for our salvation, which belongs to another category. For a Protestant *fidéiste* there exists no conflict between religion, faith, and science; he need not 'sweat blood and water' to prove the historicity of the Pentateuch, or the spirituality of the Song of Solomon. Such questions do not concern his faith, which is trust, repentance, hope, entire

[1] June, 1912: 'The Essential and the Secondary.' Dec., 1912: 'The Eternal in the Ephemeral.' Feb., 1915: 'The Sword of Peter.' March, 1917: 'Philosophical Infiltrations.'

[2] Many of his shorter treatises published by Fischbacher, 33 rue de Seine, Paris, are remarkable for their lucidity and the attractive and convincing way in which they restate various Christian dogmas, *e.g.*, The Atonement, Trinity, &c. We have nothing equal to them in English and we believe good service would be done to English readers if some half-dozen of them were translated and published in one small volume.—Ed. *M.C.*

consecration to God. All men, says Ménégoz, learned or unlearned, must know that the sole condition of salvation is inward communion with God, and that the place of a man's soul cannot be made dependent on any miraculous narrative.

Such a faith as this allowed of Ménégoz's being a scholar of very liberal views, and at the same time a true believer. The faith, which sustained, gave him a calm confidence, an optimism which never failed. Of delicate health, he awaited death with rare composure, for he believed in the life everlasting and in the efficacy of prayer.

Eugène Ménégoz has left considerable written work. In rapidly-written, but well-informed, articles he touched on all the questions of the day; and the five volumes of his *Publications relatives au fidéisme* will always reward perusal. With him France loses the last representative of the old 'Faculty' of Paris, and he has lived in retirement since 1909.

MARY C. DAWES, M.A.

BOOK NOTICES

BELIEF IN GOD*

In this book Bishop Gore offers for the consideration of 'the ordinary educated man and woman' (p. 3) the first portion of a Reconstruction of Belief. Two other volumes, possibly three, are to complete the scheme. We have no doubt that the present volume is being widely read, and that its successors will be awaited with sincere interest. There will be a general recognition among all educated readers of the clearness with which the writer states his views, of the mastery of the subject which the quest of truth 'continued over forty and more years' (p. xii) has given him, of the courage with which unwelcome facts are admitted, and of the definite character of the conclusions reached and the convictions held. More than this, there will be many readers who will follow the Bishop with agreement all the way, some of them possibly with far less clear knowledge than their guide of the reasons for which they are travellers along this particular road. Still the book is, as its author candidly tells us, an 'individual statement' (p. x), and amongst the ranks of the educated, in these days when there is no 'common mind' (p. 131), will be many who by temperament, by training, or by their experience of life have come to look out upon the things of the spirit from a different point of view. Such readers will not be less interested, but they will be less wholly in agreement. There will be points on which at least they may wish for more discussion. Of these in our present notice we venture to suggest four.

I. The distribution of the importance attached in this book to the different reasons for belief may in some minds cause surprise. The writer's interest in the subjects treated in Chapter III seems slight in proportion to the evident strength of his conviction in the eight succeeding chapters. We are not suggesting that the Bishop would rate the worth of philosophy as compared with theology as low as the proportion of one to eight, but the recognition of the value of those elements in belief which are assured through 'natural religion' and 'the general trend of contemporary philosophy' (p. 57) does seem somewhat meagre. If Truth, Beauty, Good-

* *Belief in God*, by Charles Gore, D.D., late Bishop of Oxford. London: John Murray, 1921. Price 7s. 6d.

ness are really characteristics of the Source from which all things come; if we can assent with full conviction to the statement, 'Like reason itself, of which it is an aspect, like beauty, so righteousness belongs to the universal and eternal Being, and, because this is so, men have called this Being God, and worshipped it' (p. 56), surely this takes you very far along the road. By the side of the tremendous and far-reaching verities which such a statement contains, is not the exact mode of the inspiration of the Hebrew prophets relatively a minor point? Whether the acceptance of such a belief is or is not 'a very unsatisfying religion' (p. 61) is perhaps largely a matter of temperament. In any case, he who possesses it has faced the crucial alternative, Are we to translate the meaning of the universe and of man's life in terms of matter or of spirit? and has been able to give his answer on the side of faith. The Bishop seems to set little store by the doctrine of divine immanence, yet is it necessarily pantheistic? and is the verdict of philosophy as a whole so adverse to the idea of the divine transcendence as (p. 65) this chapter seems to imply? There are books on religion—Caird's *Fundamental Ideas of Christianity* is one—in which philosophy and theology are happily complementary. In Bishop Gore's pages these are so frequently placed in contrast (pp. 65, 82, 108, 144) that the common purpose of their service is almost liable to be forgotten. No one who has read much that the Bishop has written will feel that there is the slightest probability of his ever being 'terrorized by the authority of the intellectuals' (p. 145). But, after all, are not the intellectuals his spiritual friends? To some readers Chapter III will possibly seem scant measure.

II. A second question which the book suggests, and indeed discusses, is that of the relation of Reason to Revelation. 'Perhaps there is no real justification for setting revelation and reason in opposition at all' (p. 67). And Chapter VI aims substantially at showing that Revelation, 'this divine self-disclosure' (p. 134), may be tested by the reason and found valid. On the other hand (p. 97) the character of the revelation which came through the prophets and through Jesus Christ seems to be regarded as so direct and so exceptional as to differentiate it from all the other modes in which the human mind attains to the knowledge of truth. The Bishop says expressly that the acceptance or otherwise of this revelation 'dominates the intellectual situation' (p. 97), and no reader will mistake the far-reaching character of this statement. Reference is made to Hamilton's *People of God*. In this book, and also in a shorter book published later by the same writer, *Discovery and Revelation*, the contrast was drawn with marked emphasis between what the mind of man can learn and what God wills to disclose. The point of interest is the validity of this contrast. Granted that God revealed Himself in the Hebrew Prophets and in our Lord, is it not also true that there is a revelation of God in nature, in human history, in conscience? In what relation to one another do these stand? In the same series, as different modes of the self-expression of Reality? or in such strong contrast that we that must call the one 'Revelation' and label the other by some other name? The flash of intuition by which Simon Peter exclaimed, 'Thou art the Christ,' does not seem different as a mental process from the insight which suddenly reveals to the scientific investigator a new item of chemical truth. A truth 'comes home to us,' 'strikes us,' 'becomes clear'; these are modes of revelation. We 'lay hold of a truth,' we 'grasp' it, we 'reach' it; these are modes of discovery. Have not these two processes always been complementary? and do we not find their

counterpart upon the plane of our highest interests? J. R. Illingworth once wrote:

> 'If a particular person realises the divine presence, which we believe to be latent everywhere, with exceptional vividness in a particular place, does not this constitute an actual manifestation of God to that person in that place?' (*Divine Immanence*, p. 131.)

Probably some of his readers would be glad to know how far the Bishop intends to differentiate the revelation of which he speaks in Chapters IV, V, VI from other modes of the self-manifestation of the divine.

III. Throughout the book there are repeated references to the personality of God, which is regarded as a prominent item in the message of the prophets. 'Their God is not an abstract quality to contemplate, such as beauty, justice, truth; but a being of deliberate will and energetic action, approving and disapproving, loving and hating, judging and blessing' (p. 113). This is a 'central idea of the prophetic religion' (p. 114). The Bishop recognises that 'no doubt the personality of God must be something much greater and more comprehensive than human personality' (p. 146); that 'human personality is an inadequate image of the divine' (p. 113); that we should think of God as 'super-personal' (pp. 113, 134, 146, 293). But personality, it is claimed, is at least a better image of God than mechanical force or merely vital movement or merely abstract idea' (p. 146). And the Bishop is extremely critical of all hesitation as to the use of personal terms in regard to the divine Being (65, 114, 147, 154). Possibly some of the readers of this book, while admitting that personality is the 'highest category' (p. 155) we know, and while believing that whatever is of value in human personality cannot be lacking in the nature of God, may still feel that personality as it is found in man is so truly a limitation as well as a privilege that the hesitation to speak of God in personal terms may have a good deal of justification. Our personality is so intimately connected with the fact that we live in a body—'Though the frame that binds him in his isolation grows defined'—that when we make in thought the transition from man to God, from a being with a body to one without any such limitation, it is difficult to say how much of our conception of personality can be retained. Conscious purpose, it may be said, is a mark of personality alike in God and man, yet our very use of the term 'purpose' brings the idea of God into the category of time at once. For practical use, it is true, no language is so satisfactory as that of personality in our thinking about God. Yet, in a sense, it is anthropomorphic, and the hesitation to employ it may proceed from a heightened rather than from a lowered estimate of God's nature.

IV. There is no uncertainty, nor should we have expected any, in regard to Miracles. The Bishop urges the duty of intellectual decision, 'at least a provisional decision' (p. 31), and with a very full knowledge of the available data he has himself reached quite definite conviction on this acutely debated question. The book appeals to educated people, and Lord Morley once defined an educated person as one who knew whether a thing was proved or not. Now there are probably a very large number of the Bishop's readers who will not only hold that the issue on this point is 'non-proven,' but who will plead that in the present situation the suspension of judgment is really justified. Not indifferent to the challenge to come to a decision, they will still prefer to accept their Christianity on other grounds, which in their judgement suffice, electing on this particular issue to give neither denial nor assent. The arguments for the substan-

tial reliability of the New Testament records is stated by Bishop Gore with marked cogency in Chapter VIII. Over against it we have (Chapter IX) 'the Prejudice of Criticism.' That there have been prejudiced critics in plenty, no one who knows anything of the subject need doubt. That the movement of the last fifty years has been on the whole in favour of belief, is a conviction for which many sincere people thank God. But whether the influences that to-day make men hesitate over many elements in the New Testament narrative can fairly be summed up under the term 'Prejudice,' is a point on which among thoughtful people there will probably be two opinions. To some it will seem that the general intellectual movement of the past hundred years not only justifies, but perhaps in many cases demands an attitude of cautious, patient, watchful reserve. That is not Bishop Gore's position. He has investigated the question with a thoroughness for which few men have either the time or the ability and he has reached definite and affirmative results. But if others feel that for themselves the right course is to watch and wait, they may perhaps claim that more than prejudice has gone to determine their attitude.

These are some of the points in this interesting and stimulating book on which some readers will possibly feel that there is room for more discussion. If we have dwelt on them to the exclusion of other elements in the Bishop's statement, where our attitude would rather be that of entire and grateful assent, this is perhaps not wholly unnatural in dealing with a book so singularly definite in character in an age when the opinion of thoughtful men upon subjects of the highest moment is marked by all that wide diversity which the Bishop's first chapter, on The Breakdown of Tradition, so vividly and candidly portrays.

R. B. TOLLINTON.

CHRISTIAN IDEALISM.[1]

Professor Hooke, of Toronto University, has written an excellent book for the use of study circles and individual students. Each chapter is preceded by notes indicating its scope, and, wherever necessary, by a short bibliography, and also by a set of questions. So much for the *format* of the volume. Its contents are admirable. Its spirit, as is generally the case with the publications of this movement, is religious rather than definitely institutional. The general tone is scholarly and liberal besides being picturesque and 'alive.' The final passage indicates the author's theological standpoint:

'There [*i.e.*, on the Cross] Christ lost His life and found it. There God slowly working through the ages, through the travail of man's spirit, at last in Christ found an instrument in which He could perfectly express Himself even under full and true human and historical conditions. And in dying, God in Christ entered into the world's pangs in a new way, so that we may never again think of God as merely enthroned above between the cherubim. . . . We think of God in a new way, and see that Christ did die to bring us to God. We find God there.'

[1] *Christ and the Kingdom of God*, by Professor S. H. Hooke. Student Christian Movement. 4s. 6d. net.
Christianity and International Morality, by E. H. F. Campbell, M.A. Heffer. 3s. net.
God, the Prisoner, and other Lay Sermons, by Helen Wodehouse. Allen & Unwin. 5s. net.
The Re-evangelization of England, by Cyril Hepher. Macmillan. 5s. net.
Faith Triumphant, by the Rev. Eric Montizambert, Skeffington. 5s. net.
A Book of Prayers (written for use in an Indian College). *The Challenge*, Ltd. 2s. 6d. boards, 1s. 6d. paper.

Would this satisfy the Anglican censorship? Would the E.C.U., our vigilant *gendarmes théologiques*, affix the *imprimatur?* Who can tell?

Mr. Campbell, in contrast to those writers who treat their subject *a priori* and *in vacuo,* approaches International Morality, and its relations to Christianity, from the historical standpoint. Consequently he has contributed something of real value to the discussion.

Mr. Campbell displays no sympathy for those romantic historians who attribute the dissensions of Europe to the disintegrating influences of Protestantism. Nationalism might have its dangers and shortcomings, but it was and is preferable to the Ghost of the Roman Empire sitting on the Throne of the Cæsars, for that *internationale* is a sham. Even Frederick the Great was a good deal better than the Jesuits, whom our author characterises as 'the very worst element that ever appeared in the whole course of European history.'

Hitherto it seems as if national churches were the only workable alternative to Roman Ultramontanism. Yet these, degraded as they were in some cases during the war into organs of Government propaganda, will not survive another cataclysm. The Lutheran Church of Germany is, we are told by travellers, already dead. *De te, O Ecclesia Anglicana, fabula narratur.* We cannot but agree that

> 'The international character of Christianity will need in the immediate future to be realised to an extent unusual or unknown in Europe since the sixteenth century.'

How is it to be done? The Black International Rome has been tried and found wanting. To whom shall we go? No satisfactory answer has yet been given to this question.

We have nothing but praise for Miss Wodehouse's addresses delivered to students at Bingley Training College. They are written by one who knows the world and understands human nature. The spirit of these sermons is best indicated by a short quotation, taken more or less at random from the address which gives its title to the book—*God, the Prisoner*:—

> 'In the first place . . . when we picture the universe as a world of obstacles, we ought always to picture God as being with us in the midst of them. . . . It is His work in which we are hindered, and He is hindered by us—is tied and bound by the chain of our sins.
>
> 'Secondly: He is in prison and we can come to Him. He is in prison in the neglected child, the school that needs reform. . . . He is in prison in our self; and every patient strengthening of our feeble mind and will . . . strikes off one of His chains. . . .
>
> 'But thirdly, the work of liberation will never be finished. One chain is broken; we go a little further, and we find that a longer chain still holds us. . . .'

But is this 'definite Church teaching'? All we can say is that this is bread and not stones.

Mr. Cyril Hepher's book, one of those produced by the consciousness (so widely felt) that the war made conspicuous the Church's ineffectiveness, contains many wise things. The following quotation is interesting, for it goes quite deep. The fact is that many Anglican clergymen do not mean business:—

> 'Meanwhile night by night the man we want sits in his house. He has few visitors, he is quite willing to welcome the vicar as one,

for the parson is still a privileged man, though his privileges are passing. He would rather see him there than hear him during the dinner-hour. "If he wanted to see me, he wouldn't call every time when he knows I'm out." We might do worse than revise our clerical time-table, and in place of 2.30—5.30 p.m. read 7—9 p.m. "visiting"; and the invitation to return the visit, not at our churches but in our homes, would not always be declined.' (p. 178.)

Mr. Montizambert's sermons, 'delivered to one of the peculiarly "democratic" congregations that fill our Canadian churches on Sunday evenings,' are vigorous and picturesque, and yet religious and rational. They are the kind of thing that a clergyman whose duty, or privilege, it may be to speak to working-class congregations, should study. The preacher evidently understands the ideals and the difficulties of unsophisticated people whose knowledge is not of the head but of the heart. The working-mother, the apprentice in the shops, the man who turns out at an early hour to a day of mechanical toil, the apparently empty-minded yet generous-hearted mill-girl—such an audience would listen attentively to these sermons. They would 'go down' in the industrial North.

The *Prayers for use in an Indian College* were written 'to express the "searchings after God" of men belonging to several differing religious systems,' and the author acknowledges his debt to the inspiration of Rabindranath Tagore. The prayers seem to be written in *vers libre*; they are always pleasing, and sometimes rise into something a good deal higher. The following thanksgiving appeals to us:—

'Lord,
We thank Thee that with Thee there is no growing old:
That those who abide in Thee keep their youth perpetually:
. . . . . .
We thank Thee that those who dwell in Thee
Maintain the divine faculty of youth to see the best in men.
. . . . . .
We thank Thee that they keep the keen delight of childhood
In the simple beauty of earth and sky. . . .'

J.C.H.

ANTHROPOLOGY AND ETHICS.[1]

Both these are quite valuable and scholarly volumes which should be in the hands of those clergymen who desire a clear statement of the vital problems of *origins*. There is a widespread view which may or may not be correct, that the new knowledge of religious and ethical beginnings, ridiculous, degrading, and irrational as these sometimes appear to be, has discredited many things to which we once attached supreme value.

There is no doubt that certain interpretations of conscience and of the religious instinct have tended 'to pave the way for a doctrine of complete moral irresponsibility.' Yet it would be a mistake to imagine that our religious and ethical ideals are entirely at the mercy of the psychologists and anthropologists. It may be easy to interpret everything in the lowest possible terms; religion and ethics may be 'neuroses' or

[1] *An Introduction to Anthropology*, by the Rev. E. O. James, B.Litt., F.C.S. Macmillan. 8s. net.
Conscience and Development, by the Rev. G. L. Richardson, B.D. Wells Gardner Darton & Co. 8s. net.

'tabu-survivals,' if regarded from a certain point of view; but yet if that point of view is restricted or partial the interpretation will be incorrect, and fail to be in the true sense scientific.

Possibly Mr. Richardson might be felt by some to retire further in his reaction from these new tendencies than the facts require. Yet we remember one of the more distinguished of younger anthropologists saying in our hearing that there was much more to be said for the idea of a primitive revelation than some people might suppose. And if Mr. Richardson makes use of the idea and word 'supernatural,' he does, at any rate, make it clear in what sense he uses it—a point upon which theologians are too often disingenuously reticent. He says (p. 206): 'To believe in the supernatural means primarily that our personality is spiritual—that we refuse to "force purposive types of process into the mechanical categories."' This usage is both philosophical and scientific.

With regard to Mr. James' admirable essay; it is a pity that the Broken Hill skull did not come to light a few months earlier, so that we might have had the advantage of his comments upon it. The admirable genealogical tree on p. 62 will now require some little modification, if, as seems to be the case, the new comer adds another to the three distinct branches of evolution illustrated there.

In an admirable chapter on *The Manners and Customs of Primitive Man,* Mr. James makes out a good case against the notion that sexual promiscuity was regularly prevalent amongst primitive peoples. His conclusion is that 'the *principle of monogamy* has prevailed from the beginning' in spite of certain relaxations and exceptions.

The chapter on *The Religion of Primitive Man* is the longest, and in some respects the most interesting of all. Mr. James deals fully with the subject, quotes a number of authorities, and is able to see in the dark and obscure beliefs and practices of early humanity, 'first steps in the education of the world for the reception of a Divine revelation in Christ.' And he sees in Christianity 'God's reply to the yearnings of the human heart in all ages—the completion of the religious education of the race.' In the true sense, this is an edifying book.

J.C.H.

SINITE PARVULOS.[1]

'Childhood is the time of innocence and happiness, the paradise of life, the lost Eden on which we look longingly back through the whole remaining course of our life . . . Every child is to a certain extent a genius, and the genius is to a certain extent a child. The relationship of the two shows itself primarily in the naïveté and sublime simplicity which is characteristic of true genius. . . . Whoever does not to a certain extent remain all his life a big child . . . may be a very useful and capable citizen of this world; but never a genius.'

[1] *The Child's Knowledge of God*, by the Rev. T. Grigg-Smith, M.A. Macmillan. 7s. 6d. net.
Religion and the Child, by the Ven. G. M. MacDermott, M.A., and the Rev. T. Herbert Bindley, D.D. S.P.C.K. 3s. cloth, 2s. paper.
The Christ, the Church and the Child, by the Rev. Carey Bonner. The Kingsgate Press. 4s. net.
Confirming and Being Confirmed, by the Rev. T. W. Gilbert, B.D. The Church Book Room. 2s. cloth, 1s. paper.
Prayers for Boys, collected and arranged by the Rev. Hubert H. M. Bartleet, M.A. Cornish Brothers, Birmingham.

So writes the most profound and original of nineteenth century philosophers, Schopenhauer.[2] Here he seems more in agreement with the spirit of Christ than with the spirit of those theologians who find their inspiration in the more pessimistic aspects of St. Augustine's teaching. And he is more in agreement also with the views of the present-day. Another fault that the modern educationalist discovers in the theologians is that these sorely misinterpret the attitude of Christ by making Him praise children for a virtue they do not possess, their uninquiring and sluggish docility. But 'of such is the Kingdom of Heaven' applies rather to those who have the eager curiosity, the fresh receptiveness of children.

The books which lie before us indicate that the Augustinian poison is departing from the Christian system. Mr. Grigg-Smith, whose utterances come with the official authority of a Diocesan Inspector of Schools, speaks out. And his authority is not only official, but also that which proceeds from wide experience of what is going on in an important industrial centre, where traditions of bibliolatry were, until recently, almost universal, and are still fairly widespread.

One is especially grateful to observe a tendency to realise how serious may be the mental and physical consequences for a child of an injudicious syllabus—especially if conscientiously administered by the teacher. Mr. Grigg-Smith devotes a chapter of twenty-six pages to 'The Sacrifice of Isaac,' a narrative with which every elementary school child is familiarised at the age of about five, in accordance with most current syllabuses. His tender mind is taught to recognise in this story 'a type of the Crucifixion.' Our author, with a candour that cannot be too highly praised or too widely advertised, says of the narratives of these two parallel events that they are 'totally divorced in inspiration and purpose' (p. 51). We cannot imagine how this will go down in Manchester, a region with whose cimmerian darkness we were only too familiar for some years. We are also told 'as one case out of several,' that

> 'It was three months before normal sleep returned to a five-and-a-half year old little girl after being thoughtlessly told at school in gruesome detail a Bible story that should never have been so treated.'

It is possible, however, that the results upon the nervous systems of young children of these barbarous methods are less serious than the results upon their general religious attitude. Religious instruction has been instrumental in implanting some notions very congruous to the sacramental eating of a bear among the hairy Ainus. A woman suckles a cub which is cherished and reared with much affection. The faithful then address it with prayers and afterwards strangle and squeeze it to death.[3]

So God, for their good, treats His creatures. At least these are the sentiments served up by school children for the delectation of the teachers who have misled them. We reluctantly transcribe a few specimens from page 83:

> 'We may get run over by accident, but God made the accident.'
>
> 'Perhaps he [the offender] will be poorly and go through much suffering, for God is always slow and sure.'
>
> 'If she was a woman, God would punish her by taking her baby from her, or making her marry a wicked husband.'
>
> 'Another way he could punish me is *to make me always afraid*, and always very unlucky.'

[2] See Chapter 'On Genius' in *The World as Will and Idea.*

[3] *Ainus and their Folk-lore*, Batchelor, p. 186.

We are responsible for the italics. We shudder, and pass on to a more cheerful page. Here we have some prayers written, unassisted, by girls of eight and nine reared in a happier atmosphere:

> 'O Holy Spirit, I ask thee to strengthen me when I am tempted to do wrong. Make us all holy so that this world may be better in the future. Teach me to be like God's only Son, our Saviour, so that if I succeed I may go to God's holy kingdom, with Thy help, Amen.'

Not the least valuable part of Mr. Grigg-Smith's book is an appendix of revised syllabuses. These seem altogether admirable, and further assistance for teachers is provided in the shape of an excellent bibliography (pp. 209 *f.*) besides other references. Many hard-pressed teachers, like her on p. 21 who 'hated' teaching infants about the Plagues of Egypt, but had to do so 'because it is in the syllabus,' will bless Mr. Grigg-Smith.

Mr. MacDermott and Dr. Bindley have written a compact and admirable book of ninety pages which should be in the hands of every teacher who wishes to provide the children with religious ideas which are rational, moral, and spiritual. The bibliographies, which occur at the end of each chapter, are alone worth the 2/- which we are asked for the cloth edition of this volume. The comments on various articles of the Apostles' Creed seem admirable. We are first of all told (p. 61) that

> 'The essence of Christianity is not a theory or a philosophy, but the life of a Person . . . we do not profess our belief in Christianity but in Christ.'

We are told also that in certain articles 'the phrases of "ascent," and "descent" are purely figurative' (p. 64); also with regard to the word 'Catholic':

> 'To make it mean "orthodox," or to limit it as the label of any fragment of the Church, is simply to betray ignorance . . . All baptised Christians are Catholics . . .' (p. 66).

With regard to the Resurrection of the Body:

> 'According to St. Paul's illustration the "identity" of the future spiritual resurrection body with the present earthly one is analogous to that of the living seed and the plant. "Thou sowest not that body that shall be"; yet the principle of life is continuous although the outer organism . . . is changed' (p. 68).

The remarks on the Commandments are equally sensible and equally *religious*. For example, with regard to 'the Sabbath' we read:

> 'The right attitude is not to ask, "May I do this or that?" but "What will best bring home to me as a Christian the great truth of the Resurrection? How can I best be employed so as to rise myself, and help others to rise, above common things to the contemplation and worship of the Majesty of God?"'

This book indeed inculcates a 'reasonable service,' and not a fear-ridden slavery. The children are to become, if they are not already, 'the Lord's free-men.'

Mr. Carey Bonner, in his *Ridley Lectures* to students preparing themselves for the Free Church ministry, discusses the problem how to secure the interest, co-operation, and loyalty of the young people. The spirit of the book is sound: it views the children from the right standpoint; they are not sinners to be saved, but beings of a purer clay from whom we may learn much. Ministers of religion are urged to put away pose

and aridity, pedantry and self-consciousness, and to 'covet the title of "the Children's Friend."' Better advice could not be given. This book, like the others, contains an admirable bibliography which occupies seventeen pages.

Whoever attempts to compile a sensible and useful manual for the use of the young clergyman preparing candidates for confirmation, deserves our sincere gratitude. This is what the Rev. T. W. Gilbert has done. Every chapter is preceded by a summary of its contents, and followed by a series of questions upon these. The matter itself is good and is clearly put. The author is a scholar without being recondite or pedantic, religious without being unctuous, moral without being sentimental. (There is also a refreshing absence of the 'nasty' element, dear to the heart of the religious director obsessed with the sexual complex). We heartily recommend this admirable book. It deserves the widest circulation.

For Mr. H. M. Bartleet's selection of daily private devotions for boys, we have nothing but praise. Every teacher knows what difficulty some young people have in knowing 'how to pray.' This manual might serve as a gift to any boy. The giver need not spoil his gift by talking about it. Silence is golden.

J.C.H.

THE UNTRIED DOOR.*

No one can fail to sympathise with the avowed intention of this latest book by the author of *The Jesus of Poets and Prophets.* Mr. Roberts tells us in the opening sentence of his preface that the book is meant to be in the nature of a challenge. 'We are being told,' he says, 'by many voices that the only hope of the world lies in following Jesus. But we are not told with any explicitness what 'following Jesus' means. Here an endeavour is made to discover the mind of Jesus and to see how far it shows us a way out of the intolerable confusion into which life has fallen.' The author, we may feel sure, would be the last to claim that his book does more than intimate a method of approach to an inexhaustible subject. But in so saying we would not seem to minimise the value of the attempt, for in fact this brief work of less than two hundred pages contains very much that is stimulating and suggestive.

To say of a book that 'it will be useful for sermons,' while it may serve to give it a place on the shelves of the hard-worked parish priest, will be considered by many as faint praise. Yet in this case the words are true—and true in the best sense. The preacher who goes to this book will find, not indeed ready-made discourses, but something of far greater value—a sense of freshness and beauty, an originality of outlook, and, best of all, a fearless love of truth, which enables the writer to penetrate to essentials, and to present the thoughts and ideals of Jesus in a living relation to present problems.

The book will be widely read by many who would not touch more technical volumes. Its language is studiously simple, and the few theological terms employed are explained with meticulous exactness. It is a *layman's* book in that it portrays a Christ who is concerned with real problems, a Christ whose manhood is uncompromised, but who yet 'makes claims which seem to put him in a class apart from the ordinary man.' In this Christ, as Bernard Shaw has testified, the layman is as deeply interested as the theologian. He cannot be hid. We cannot escape Him. Those who think to drive Christ from the world are set on a fruitless and

* *The Untried Door*, by Richard Roberts. S.C.M., 1921. Price 5/- net.

futile endeavour. Mr. Roberts, like so many of his contemporaries, is careful to disclaim the *rôle* of theologian, and yet inevitably in seeking to explain the eternal significance of Jesus, he, like all his fellow writers, becomes involved in theological problems.

The 'values' of Jesus, to use a modern term, are what the world needs to learn and to appreciate. Here in a single sentence is the central truth which, if we understand him aright, Mr. Roberts wrote his book in order to emphasise. The book might have had as its title 'A Study in the Perspective of Life.' Jesus, as T. R. Glover has put it, was a Son of Fact. He saw things as they really are, and so seeing them, arranged the values of life after a new scale. This rearrangement of values is the dominant theme of the whole book. The Spiritual before the Material, the Inward before the Outward, Men before Things, Life before Institutions, Truth before Tradition. Such was the scale of life's values as Jesus saw it. Can we doubt that Jesus was right, or that a world fashioned according to His mind would be a world redeemed?

W. Maurice Pryke.

LYRA EVANGELICA.*

The author of one of the most interesting of books dealing with a great Public School from the masters' not the boys' point of view, has written a little book of verse which deserves to be widely read. The poems are sincere and have a certain *curiosa felicitas*. They suggest that Christian ideals and conduct are the cure for a disillusioned world. The note struck by the poet is that of the dying Amiel.

> 'Destiny has two ways of disappointing us; by thwarting our wishes, and by fulfilling them. He who only wills what God wills escapes them both.'

The quality of Mr. Bradby's verse can be judged by the two following poems:—

In Hoc Signo.

The Kingdoms of the Earth go by
In purple and in gold;
They rise, they triumph, and they die,
And all their tale is told.

. . . . .

One kingdom only is divine,
One banner triumphs still,
Its king a servant, and its sign
A gibbet on a hill.

'Be Wise.'

To certain followers, who misunderstood
His gentleness, and thought that to be good
Meant to be foolish, flouted common sense,
To facts preferred a pious ignorance,
And strewed the path with stumbling-blocks that made
Life difficult for others, Jesus said,
He best will serve his brothers who shall prove
'Wise as a serpent, harmless as a dove.'

We observe that Mr. Bradby follows ecclesiastical tradition rather than modern criticism in his poem, 'In the House of Simon,' by identifying the woman who was a sinner with Mary Magdalen. We don't blame him

* *The Way*, by G. F. Bradby. Oxford University Press (1921), price 1/6.

for this. A careful study of the Greek Testament does not suggest that it was the 'anxious mothers,' but the dutiful fathers who brought their young children to Jesus that He might bless them (Mk. x, 13, 14). Here Mr. Bradby also errs in good company.

H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CREED OF THE AVERAGE ENGLISHMAN.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

Sir,

The chief merit of Mr. Arthur Walker's interesting paper on 'The Creed of the Average Englishman' lies in its life-like portrayal of a certain type, and in his defence of the attitude of that type towards traditional worship.

But after setting out to find his average Englishman to 'see what he is like,' we fear he lost his track, and cannot be congratulated on the result. The average Englishman is not to be found, we fear, in the ranks of golfers, motorists, mountaineers, nor amongst those who 'imbibed a certain amount of dogmatic religion along with their Greek and Latin.' The average Englishman knows nothing of Greek and Latin or the school-ground where Mother Church has exercised her influence. Just as little is he found in 'the city restaurant,' or very frequently 'in a railway compartment,' and never is he found arriving at a negation of belief by too much thinking, but only by not thinking at all.

What Mr. Walker has found is, after all, only the average of a certain class, represented by the Public School boy who finishes up as an habitué of a city club on the week-day and of the golf-house on Sundays. And in his own words, there would be 'hope for the old faith yet' if the creed and code of this type were also those of the average Englishman.

Of the ten million adult men of England we must look for our middle man not too near the upper third, but seek him in the strata of the small provincial tradesman, in the upper ten of the skilled artizans of the industrial centres. We must wend our way (preferably on Sundays) to the abodes of the semi-detached with a pre-war rental of twenty pounds and a chicken-run down the garden. What respect for tradition still lingers will be found in the 'front parlour' where a large copy of the authorised version is saved from irreverent hands by the perennial mat fortified by the inevitable aspidistra.

Among the more docile of this class are the pillars of the local chapel, or the Churchman who joins the C.E.M.S. and sings in the choir, generally simple and sincere men who make no enquiries, and are troubled by no doubts. Among those of more independent spirit the creed is mainly self-regarding, not to rise too early on Sunday, dig during the morning and overhaul the chickens, read the newspaper for some hours of the day, and loll away the rest. Such classes never exercise consciously the faculty of belief, and will greet your enquiries with a bovine stare.

Does this average Englishman believe in Jesus Christ? Ask him the difference between a gospel and an epistle, and you will find the measure of his grasp of the reality of New Testament history.

No, the average Englishman has no creed. He walks where local and family influence lead him, and takes what religion he has on the strength of authority, for in matters of religion he has never been taught to think.

E. Russell Brittain.

Pyeford, Surrey.
November 29th, 1921.

[We regret to state that Mr. Walker died quite suddenly a few days after the publication of his article. Long press notices indicate how greatly he was beloved and respected in business and civic circles in his own locality. He was a practising Christian and a regular attendant at Divine worship, and he belonged essentially to that type of Englishman which has so largely built up the British Nation and Empire. Men of this sort are unable to take things, either in religion or morality, simply on authority, and feel that they must do their thinking for themselves. They do not, as our correspondent rightly points out, constitute anything more than a minority in our communities, but they do exercise a very powerful influence on the thought and practice of their community. If the Church had their reverence and loyalty, her influence would be paramount in the national life.—Ed., *M.C.*]

THE COUNTRY PARISH AND REUNION.

Sir,

In answer to your request to put before your readers my opinions on re-union and the experience of my efforts in that behalf, I venture to reply to your request, although I fear they will seem almost too simple to be thought worthy of consideration. The cry for re-union or unity seems to be in effect a cry for an outward and visible sign of a unity already existing:—for we are all one by the possession of the One Spirit—and some such outward signs are ready to hand.

I do not offer to criticise the efforts of our Church authorities for beginning at the top and attempting to achieve a plan for the recognition and co-operation of different classes of the ministry. But in country parishes I am sure the practical way is to begin at the bottom by making our own parish the instrument of that wider Reunion of Christendom which we hope may one day be achieved.

We have in the parish church, with its churchyard and sacred associations and tender memories, a place common to all. Here, in country places at least, is the one building which is by common consent supremely suitable for acts of united worship. For the adult and responsible Christian one act of worship is the most sacred of all. I mean that of Holy Communion. Let all the parishioners be invited on suitable occasions, of which Easter should be one, to unite in the parish church in celebrating it. There is no difficulty as to Confirmation in such cases, as the attitude of the bishops has now removed it. Those who have ventured to do this have not been disappointed by the nature of the response, and the good feeling which it has helped to create has been, we hope, one step forward towards the goal of a united fellowship thus visibly manifested.

I am afraid this is a very bald statement, but I am sure that though it seems so simple it would lay the foundation, and in a right way, for much greater things.

C. R. Garnett-Botfield.

Moreton Vicarage, Oswestry,
28th November, 1921.

MR. MURRAY'S PUBLICATIONS.

THE DAYSPRING.

By ARTHUR GOLDSMITH SPARROW, Author of 'The Soul of Chivalry.' With a Foreword by H. A. VACHELL. **9s.** net. [*Just out.*

'The Dayspring,' with an illuminating Foreword by Horace Annesley Vachell, deals with life's fundamentals and is founded in the belief that beneath the wide surface of materialism, the men and women of to-day are almost unconsciously, but none the less actually, reaching out towards a future that shall be spiritual.

The writer sees the passing of the old and the birth of the new; the need of a simple faith—the Fatherhood of God, the childhood of man—to heal the wounds of the world and to bring back happiness and order to earth. In his preface he tells us that he has attempted 'to paint something of the loveliness of Jesus.' To the leaders of religious thought, to the social reformer, to the disillusioned, the troubled, the doubting, the suffering, this work should appeal, for it deals with matter that is in many minds and its message is one of hope.

Third large Edition of Dr. Gore's new and important work on the Reconstruction of Belief.

BELIEF IN GOD.

By CHARLES GORE, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., formerly Bishop of Oxford. **7s. 6d.** net.

This volume, which represents a life-time of study and thought, is an attempt to construct a rational fabric of belief from the foundation, as far as may be without assumptions. The author enquires afresh what are the grounds, first, for any sort of belief in God, and secondly, for belief in a specific revelation such as Christianity postulates.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By the REV. J. E. SYMES, M.A., sometime Principal of University College, Nottingham; Author of 'Broad Church,' 'A Short Text-book of Political Economy,' etc. **18s.** net. [*Just out.*

This volume should interest all educated people who wish to know in what order and in what circumstances the books of the New Testament were written; and how they came to occupy their unique position among Christian writings. The twenty-seven books are dealt with, as far as possible, in their chronological order—an order which differs greatly from that of our Bible. The author emphasizes those points upon which something like agreement has been reached, indicating the grounds for the conclusions arrived at, and the degree of confidence with which they are held. The more important of the problems still under dispute are briefly discussed, and a summary is given of the arguments of the best modern critics, both 'orthodox' and 'advanced.'

A CHAIN OF PRAYER ACROSS THE AGES.

Compiled by **S. F. FOX, M.D., B.Sc.** Forty Centuries of Prayer, 2000 B.C.—A.D. 1920. Arranged for daily use with an Index of Subjects and Authors. Third Edition (Eighth Impression). **5s.** net.

THE PSALMS IN HUMAN LIFE.

By **ROWLAND E. PROTHERO** (**Lord Ernle**). "It is in reality the 'Romance of the Psalms,' and abounds in pure and lofty thought."—*Daily Telegraph.* **2s. 6d.** net.

THE ETERNAL SAVIOUR-JUDGE.

By the **Rev. J. LANGTON CLARKE, D.D.** With an Introduction by the **Rev. J. R. ILLINGWORTH, D.D.** Many have been impressed and strengthened by the profound eschatological truth to be found in this book. Third Edition. **4s.** net.

SHORTENED AND SIMPLIFIED EDITION. **2s.** net.

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street, London, W.1.

CHILDREN'S BOOKS.

BASIL BLACKWELL

BROAD STREET OXFORD.

Illustrated Christmas List

on application.

STORIES OF COURSE.

By HILDA FINNEMORE. *7s. 6d.* net.

With Illustrations in Colour and Line by GEORGE MORROW.

'*Stories of Course* which is pictured by Morrow,
Is the book to buy, to steal, or to borrow.'—*The New Statesman.*

'Those children who have ever been fortunate enough to hear Hilda Finnemore tell a story in person must have had two lucky stars present at their birthday. Those, too, will be only a degree less happy who possess her "Stories of Course."'—*Yorkshire Post.*

THE FRIEND OF LITTLE CHILDREN.

A CHILD'S LIFE OF CHRIST.

By J. SINCLAIR STEVENSON. Introduced by THE BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL.

12 Coloured Plates. 130 Pen Drawings. £1/1/- net

From the Bishop's Introduction:—

'The writer of this book possesses special gifts for the task he has undertaken. He has *Insight*, he has *Imagination*, he has *Sympathetic Knowledge*. . . . Such a book written by such an author has a Mission in these days. A father or mother can read its pages to their children with perfect confidence.'

LIFE: HOW IT COMES.

A Child's Book of Elementary Biology. By STEPHEN REID-HEYMAN (Mrs. Laurence Parsons, M.D., Ch.B.). Introduced by THE BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM. 5s. net.

From the Bishop's Introduction:—

'There is a very great need for a reverent and clear statement to children of the facts of sex; and this book is deserving of the study both of the young themselves, and of those who wish the coming generation to be rightly guided in this matter.'

ONY-O-DREAMS.

By M. NIGHTINGALE.

8 Coloured Plates. 100 Pen Drawings.

By C. T. NIGHTINGALE. *7s. 6d.* net.

'That rare thing, a long fairy-tale in which the interest is sustained to the last page.'—*The Outlook.*

'A fascinating book. . . . Dreams and reality are skilfully interwoven . . the illustrations are as charming as the stories.'—*The Spectator.*

COMMUNION AND FELLOWSHIP:

Dedicated to those who have passed Beyond the Veil.

By H. A. DALLAS.

Introduction by Sir W. F. BARRETT, F.R.S.

POST FREE, **2s. 2d.**

The aim: To realise, by prayer, unbroken fellowship with friends in the Unseen.

MESSRS. RIDER & SON, LTD., Paternoster Row, E.C. 4,
and from the AUTHOR, Innisfail, Crawley, Sussex.

J. WIPPELL & Co., Ltd.

ECCLESIASTICAL ART WORKERS.	MAKERS OF CLERICAL OUTFIT.
EMBROIDERY, WOOD, STONE, METAL, AND STAINED GLASS.	CLOTHING, HATS, CASSOCKS, SURPLICES, ROBES, HOODS, STOLES, VESTMENTS, ETC.

EXETER 55 & 56, HIGH STREET, AND CATHEDRAL YARD; & 4 & 5, DUNCANNON ST., CHARING CROSS, LONDON.

CASTELL & SON.

(ESTABLISHED 1846).

Tailors, Robe Makers, and Clerical Outfitters,

13 BROAD STREET, OXFORD.

Representatives travel regularly and appointments are respectfully solicited.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN'S LIBRARY.

Edited by the Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

3*s.* 6*d.* net each volume. In Paper Covers, 2*s.* net each.

I. The Faith of a Modern Churchman. By the Rev. Canon M. G. GLAZEBROOK, D.D., Canon of Ely. *Second Edition.*

'His simple statement of Christian doctrine is characterised by courage, wide learning, a broad point of view, and a very real reverence.'—*The Scotsman.*

II. The Genius of the English Church. By the Rev. ALFRED FAWKES, M.A., Vicar of Ashby St. Ledgers.

'We hope it may secure a very wide circle of readers.'—*The Spectator.*

III. The Evolution of the Christian Ministry. By the Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A. (sometime Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford).

'We do not know anyone who could have written it better.'—*Expository Times.*

IV. Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist. By the Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D., Vicar of St. Mary's, Leigh Woods.

'His clear and reverent treatment of a difficult subject . . . will commend the book to Churchmen of all schools.'—*Nation.*

JOHN MURRAY, Albemarle Street, LONDON, W.1.

RIPON HALL, OXFORD.

(Founded by the Right Rev. W. BOYD CARPENTER, D.D., D.C.L., at Ripon in 1898, moved to Oxford in 1919).

Warden—The Right Rev. H. M. BURGE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford.
Principal—Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.
Vice-Principal—Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D., Fellow of University College, Oxford.
Chaplain—Rev. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A.

This Theological College is centrally situated and provides, in conjunction with the Oxford University Ordination Course with which it co-operates, an adequate modern training for Candidates for Holy Orders in any diocese.

The academic year consists of three terms of about nine weeks each. There is a fourth (but non-compulsory) term in the Long Vacation.

Graduates are eligible for admission and also Non-Graduate Service Candidates.

Applications for admission should be addressed to THE PRINCIPAL.